DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 051 RC 006 081

AUTHOR	Klimoski, Victor J., Ed.; Quinn, Bernard, Ed.
TITLE	Church and Community; Nonmetropolitan America in Transition.
INSTITUTION	Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate, Washington, D.C.; Saint John's Univ., Collegeville, Minn.
REPORT NO	CARA-TC-4
PUB DATE	Jan 71
NOTE	101p.
AVAILABLE FROM	CARA Research Reports, Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, D.C. 20036 ($2.50 plus postage)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Changing Attitudes; *Church Role; Community; Cultural Environment; Political Attitudes; *Religious Factors; Rural Areas; *Rural Urban Differences; Schools; *Social Factors; Values

ABSTRACT

As the church seeks to respond to the human needs arising in our ever-changing society, it must constantly reassess its role in nonmetropolitan areas. At this critical juncture in the history of our country, the nature of the church's mission in town and country is a subject of great debate. For both urban and rural America, this CARA (Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate) study advises that the church's role in an era of change requires both theological and ethical analysis of the sociological facts so that the church can make an adequate response to the dilemmas of our communities. While the scope of this response will differ in the urban and nonmetropolitan areas, its nature is the same. This includes sustaining the community; helping the diocese or the parish to interpret its responses and catalyze this response; and, through its preaching and sacramental ministry, uniting all men with God and with one another more effectively. It is within this perspective that the 8 articles in this book are presented. The articles result from 2 projects: the Office of Pastoral Studies at St. John's School of Divinity, Collegeville, Minnesota, and the Micro-City Project. Intended as an introduction to the small community today and its projected future, these lectures provide an understanding of the change affecting small communities as well as ideas that might help the individual face the realities of change so that he can evaluate and plan in a spirit of hope rather than defeat. (TS)

ED 062051

RECEIVED
MAY 8 1972
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

CHURCH AND COMMUNITY

Nonmetropolitan America in Transition

Edited by

Victor J. Klimoski
and Bernard Quinn

RC006081

Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate · Washington, D.C.

CARA Information Service
Town & Country Report #4
January, 1970

PRODUCED AND PUBLISHED in cooperation with the Micro-City Project, St. John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota. The Micro-City Project is supported by the Ford Foundation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT is made to the Order of St. Benedict, Collegeville, Minnesota, for permission to reprint "Social Change in Nonmetropolitan Society," by H. Wilson Yates, which appeared in the June/July 1969 issue of Worship.

PERMISSION is hereby granted to reproduce any portion of this book, except for copyrighted materials quoted from other sources, provided full credit is given the authors.

COVER DESIGN by Michael E. Grimes.

CARA's GOAL: To discover, promote, and apply modern techniques and scientific informational resources for practical use in a coordinated and effective approach to the Church's social and religious mission in the modern world, at home and overseas.

CARA Information Service is distributed at cost price. This issue $2.50.

Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate (CARA)
1717 Massachusetts Ave., NW - Washington, D.C. 20036

Dedicated to

EDWIN VINCENT O'HARA, 1881-1956

Founder of the
National Catholic Rural Life Conference

FOREWORD

One of the most unheralded aspects of contemporary life is that approximately one-third of the American people -- or 67 million Americans -- live in town and country U.S.A. From every side, we hear a steady stream of debate and discussion, and validly so, about the trials and turbulence facing urban America. Contrarily, the life and difficulties of rural America which once dominated our national consciousness seldom receive a full hearing.

In many ways this is unfortunate, precisely because urban and rural America are alike caught up in the contemporary process of rapid social change. Of course, the nonmetropolitan areas face unique difficulties of their own, largely brought about by extensive migration and by a loss of the traditional sense of community and personal identity which helped give certain well-recognized values to rural life. Still, the future of urban and rural America remains deeply intertwined and, unless both Church and community learn to recognize this reality, we may not find ourselves coping as we should with the dilemmas posed by social change today.

As we seek to comprehend what has happened to the city, then, we should also try to understand the problems of rural social change. The virtue of this latest report by CARA -- The Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate -- is that it treats of the critical issues facing nonmetropolitan America within the context of the processes of rapid social change which affect our entire society, such processes as urbanization, greater centralization of governmental power, and interdependence of public and private interests and organizations.

For both urban and rural America, this CARA study advises, the Church's role in an era of change requires both theological and ethical analysis of the sociological facts so that the Church can make an adequate response to the dilemmas of our communities. While the scope of this response will differ in the urban and nonmetropolitan area, its nature is the same. This includes sustaining the community, helping the diocese and the parish interpret its responses and catalyze this response, and through its preaching and sacramental ministry, to unite all men with God and with each other more effectively.

By its response, the Church can and ought to be a decisive factor in directing social change toward true human fulfillment. Through an

alert ministry it must insert into this change the principles of social justice, community solidarity, and charity. It will devolve upon the Church to prove the falsity of a Marxian, purely economic interpretation of history by showing that spirit can deflect a materialistically orientated technology from what might otherwise be a collision course with man's deepest aspirations for integral human fulfillment. This CARA study will offer much to help religious leaders in nonmetropolitan America who desire that the Church in fact be such a decisive factor.

This latest study, Church and Community, published by CARA's Town & Country Department, makes no pretense of having all the answers to the questions confronting the Church in nonmetropolitan U. S. A. today. As the latest publication of CARA's continuing town and country research program, however, it provides an invaluable framework within which both Church and community can examine their mutual concerns. Some will not agree with this framework,but no one can fail to be moved by the cogency of the arguments presented and the appropriateness of many points it raises. CARA is to be thanked for serving as a coordinating mechanism for bringing studies of this kind to a broad church public, and the St. John's School of Divinity at Collegeville, Minnesota, the Minnesota Council of Churches and the Micro-City Project are in our debt for cooperating so effectively to produce this singular report.

CARA's Town and Country Department, so ably developed for the Center by the Glenmary Fathers, marks a new departure for the U. S. Church in our efforts to cope with communities in transition. All those concerned with the future of the Church in nonmetropolitan America will find that the present study not only meets the high standards of CARA's previous Town and Country reports, but that it builds on these, opening up greater horizons for the Church's religious and social mission.

+ George H. Speltz
Bishop of St. Cloud

PREFACE

As the Church seeks to respond to the human needs that arise in our ever-changing society, it must constantly re-assess its role in non-metropolitan areas. At this critical juncture in the history of our country, the nature of the Church's mission in town and country is a subject of great debate. Two positions seem to be at loggerheads. On the one side is the view of those who prefer that the Church seek to dull the impact of social change. On the other side are those who contend that the Church act dynamically to help the community come to terms with such realities as the two-hundred "new towns" which will be built in formerly rural areas by the year 2000.

In this debate the participants more often agree with each other than not. The difficulty is, however, that because each group has a different perspective on the nature of contemporary social change, they frequently talk past each other rather than to the issue at hand.

It is a truism to say that rapid social change -- the intertwined phenomenon of urbanization, greater interdependence, specialization and complexity -- is today's hallmark. This process affects every community, whether numbering 200 or 50,000 persons.

As Margaret Mead has pointed out, this phenomenon is also a two-edged sword. For while it clears paths of technological advancement, it does not leave untouched the institutional structures and forms which served another day when those paths were still dreams. A predominant theme in the following articles is that of the larger community or functional planning area which goes beyond the neatly drawn boundaries of present counties, towns, and villages. Such a theme does not imply a capitulation to the forces of change, forsaking the serentity of our "home towns" for the glutted congestion of "cities." On the contrary, the larger community is where people have lived, worked, played, and worshipped for years. Yet, many fail to see that the advantages of a larger center of production and distribution have further implications for the other aspects in the life of their town or village.

When people speak of the need for a larger community as an essential base for planning, they are not overlooking the values of small town living. They are nonetheless concerned with all the needs of people -- needs that can often be fulfilled only when small groupings of people can cooperate with one another in providing adequate means of achieving high standards

in education, medical facilities, recreation, labor, products, and services. This concern extends to all the institutions in society including the Church.

Many contemporary social critics decry the purported failures by public and private bodies, including the Church, to help prepare people for a world of rapid social change. Others are disturbed by the nature of the Church's response to change itself. Still others debate whether or not the Church, by its supposed inertia, is impeding the larger community from grappling with the challenges before nonmetropolitan America today.

Our concern is these papers, however, is not with sterile quarrels but with what the Church must do here and now to undertake its proper religious and social mission in town and country U. S. A. The pace of change does not allow sufficient time to discuss, analyze, and debate past failures. While acknowledging them, we must seek to meet the present, for the present will shape the future. As Christians, as the Church, we must be ready to evaluate what is happening and move in the direction that will benefit the welfare of men. This is an essential part of our mission and witness as Christians.

In a sense, this implies a radical Christian life that is reflected in an observation of William Stringfellow's:

> There is no man, whatever his lot in life, beyond the outreach of the gospel or outside the range of the witness of the faithful. There is no nation or institution, no thing at all, whatever its characteristics or appearance, which is not a concern of the gospel or within the scope of the Church's mission. There is no issue or event anywhere or any time which is not addressed by the gospel and which is not the responsibility of the Body of Christ. The matters which occupy and preoccupy the daily attentions of secular existence are the issues which claim the attention of the Christian faith. [1]

But this "radical" expression of Christian convictions does not reside merely in the unconventional. On the contrary, it finds expression in the concern of people with the total welfare of their community, in

---

[1] William Stringfellow, Free in Obedience: The Radical Christian Life (New York: Seabury, 1964), p. 16. [Used by permission.]

their willingness to cooperate with other concerned groups -- including Federal and State agencies, universities, industry, and business -- in order to achieve the goals of human development. As long as we are content to enclose ourselves in narrowmindedness, preferring to blame formless culprits for the social changes wrought by progress and to invent weak excuses for our inactivity, we will have no part in the future. Communities will nevertheless change -- but without our direction, help, or control.

The following articles are presented within this perspective of the Christian mission. They are the results of two projects that attempted to discuss some of the dimensions of the nonmetropolitan community in transition and the relationship of the Church to it. Last spring, the Office of Pastoral Studies at St. John's School of Divinity, Collegeville, Minnesota, in cooperation with the Micro-City Project, presented six lectures that were intended as an introduction to the small community today and its projected future. Independent of this series, but certainly complementary to it, was the Consultation on the Church in Community Life sponsored by the Minnesota Council of Churches at St. Cloud State College. We feel that together these lectures provide not only an understanding of the change affecting our small communities but also insights and ideas that might help people facing the realities of change to evaluate and plan in a spirit of hope rather than in a spirit of defeat.

We are indebted to many people for their help in bringing this publication about: Michael Grimes and William Lester of St. John's School of Divinity; Father Kieran Nolan, OSB, Director of St. John's Pastoral Office; Dr. Edward L. Henry and the Micro-City Project; Rev. George Tjaden and the Minnesota Council of Churches; the St. Cloud Diocesan Rural Life Office; and Francis Gannon, Mildred Williams, and Irene Payne of the CARA staff.

Victor J. Klimoski

Collegeville, Minnesota
January 5, 1970

CONTRIBUTORS

WILLIAM L. COFELL. Chairman, Education Department, St. John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota. Vice-chairman, Minnesota Advisory Commission on Teacher Education. Director, Central Minnesota Educational Research and Development Council.

GEORGE A. DONOHUE. Chairman, Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota (St. Paul Campus). Staff sociologist, Experimental City Program.

EDWARD GROSS. Professor of Sociology, University of Washington, Seattle. Manpower Consultant to the United States Government.

EDWARD L. HENRY. Professor of Government, St. John's University, Collegeville, Minnesota. Mayor, St. Cloud, Minnesota. Executive Director, Micro-City Project. (The Micro-City Project, initiated in 1968 through a Ford Foundation grant, has as its purpose the study of problems of cities in the 10,000 to 50,000 population range.)

ARLEON KELLEY. Associate Executive Director, Ohio Council of Churches. Affiliate Professor of Church Planning, Christian Theological Seminary, Indianapolis. Director, Functional Community Study, Bloomington and Marion, Indiana.

OSGOOD T. MAGNUSON. Associate Professor of Agricultural Extension, University of Minnesota. Assistant State Leader, 4-H and Youth Development. Chairman, Leisure Studies, Inc. (leisure education programs). Chairman, Town Meeting, Inc. (community social concerns).

E. W. MUELLER. Director, Center for Community Organization and Area Development (CENCOAD), Augustana College, Sioux Falls, South Dakota. Former Associate Secretary of the Department of Church and Community Planning of the Lutheran Council in the USA, Chicago.

GEORGE K. TJADEN. Associate Director, Minnesota Council of Churches. Director, Department of Town and Country Church, and the Outstate Division of the Department of Planning and Mission, Minnesota Council of Churches.

H. WILSON YATES. Assistant Professor, Church and Community, United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities, New Brighton, Minnesota.

CONTENTS

Foreword, by Bishop George H. Speltz		v
Preface		viii
Contributors		x
1. Social Change and the Church in Nonmetropolitan Society	H. WILSON YATES	1
2. The Rural System as an Ideal Model	GEORGE A. DONOHUE EDWARD GROSS	23
3. The School and the Church in Changing Rural America	WILLIAM L. COFELL	35
4. Rural-Urban Balance: Looking Ahead to 1980	EDWARD L. HENRY	49
5. Protestant and Ecumenical Response to the Church's Town & Country Mission	GEORGE K. TJADEN	60
6. Is the Church on the Offensive?	E. W. MUELLER	67
7. Tactics for the Church on the Offensive	ARLEON KELLEY	79
8. Planning for Tomorrow: Cooperation for Human Development	OSGOOD T. MAGNUSON	87

1. SOCIAL CHANGE AND THE CHURCH IN NONMETROPOLITAN SOCIETY

H. Wilson Yates

At this juncture in American history we stand in the midst of social crisis. We see it in the city where ghetto despair, slum riots, deteriorating physical conditions and environmental pollution have left indelible marks. We see it in rural society where conditions of economic and social deprivation, conservation malpractice, and dying towns scar the landscape. No sector of society can escape being a participant. Society as a whole is involved, and all sectors in the society must respond.

In this paper we will consider how this crisis has affected rural society and in what directions the church needs to move in responding to it. Our focus will be broad in scope, resting primarily on an examination of certain characteristics and processes of change affecting nonmetropolitan America, and on fundamental roles the church can play, conditions it must meet, and ecumenical involvements it may develop in responding dramatically to this change.

In our discussion three myths will be considered. These myths have to do with the nature of the community and the nature of the church's own self-understanding in its response to the community. We will argue that these myths, though they may at one time have carried constructive insights into the meaning of social and institutional life, no longer do so. In effect, the images they convey are distortions of social reality and therefore no longer serve as constructively informing insights for determining action.

To turn then to the first part of our discussion on change in nonmetropolitan America, let us begin with the first of these myths -- the myth of "the unchanging small town community."

Change in Nonmetropolitan America

In this myth we have the image of a small community, one which is relatively isolated from the major problems of the city and the world at large. It is a town which has changed very little and is likely to change very little, is autonomous, independent, and homogeneous in its make-

up. Its traditions are established; its patterns of relationships are known and abided by. It considers its values to be the core values of American society. It is marked by friendliness and by a general openness. It is democratic with a certain authoritarianism particularly in the family and in the church. Its basic mode of economic operation, so the myth goes, is that of production rather than consumption. It is not a poor community, but neither is it affluent. It is the idealized image of the nineteenth century town of American folklore.

The myth is, of course, not without certain elements of truth. There are continuities in small town society, and certain of its patterns have remained relatively unaffected by change. But the fact remains that the general image the myth conveys is a distorted reflection of the real state of rural society and, insofar as it remains operative, it inhibits an adequate response to social change. For depending on the extent to which it is appealed to and the degree to which it is accepted, it invites individuals to ignore change. It allows them to assume that change is an option which a community can accept or reject rather than something which must be dealt with through planning and control. It reinforces the false assumption that change, though occurring in certain areas such as technology, does not really affect other dimensions of community life such as its social organization or its fundamental value system. Furthermore, it tends to perpetuate the rural-urban dichotomy at a point where such a differentiation can be highly misleading, for it implies that the reality of change is a condition which distinguishes urban America from rural America, when in fact the whole of American society is experiencing change and in general terms the same basic processes of change.

It is obvious, therefore, that this myth must be buried and replaced by a more realistic appraisal of the phenomenon of change in small town society. This appraisal must be made by the citizens of such a society and, from our standpoint, by the churches within the society. In effect, some general appreciation of the nature of change and its meaning should become an overall concern of the people and the churches of nonmetropolitan society. Though we cannot hope to consider in any detail what such a recognition includes, it is possible to sketch at least certain important characteristics and processes of change affecting small town society.

First, change is not new to American society but has been one of its dominant characteristics throughout the history of the nation. This century, however, has seen a sharp acceleration in the rate of change -- a rate exponential rather than gradual. One needs only think of the

technological revolution to appreciate this fact.

Secondly, though change has been more dominant in certain spheres of our society (e.g., the economic sphere) than in other spheres (e.g., the cultural), all spheres of the social system have been affected. Change, therefore, is not a matter of isolated instances in which the remaining structure and organization of society remain basically unchanged. Rather change is a phenomenon which affects all dimensions of society. Furthermore, we must recognize that change in one area inevitably causes change in other areas. For example, technological change has left its mark not only on methods of farming but on the role of the family in the farming enterprise, on manpower needs, on the role of education, and so on. [1]

A third factor in understanding change in rural society is that it reflects in general the same broad processes which affect society as a whole. The rural-urban dichotomy, as has been suggested, is a misleading bifurcation if we mean that there is a sharp contrast between rural and urban America in either its essential value orientations and goal priorities, or the basic direction toward which it is moving. There may indeed be differences in the degree to which certain types of change take place. At a more specific level, change manifests itself through structures which may be unique to each realm, but in broad terms rural and urban America are linked in common processes of movement. Unfortunately, this commonality has been inadequately recognized, to the detriment of both sectors of society, and has contributed to the suspicions of one for the other at points where cooperation is needed, as we have all too often observed in state and national legislatures.

Given this general discussion, let us turn to a more specific examination of certain basic processes of change. What will be offered in this examination is a general paradigm for understanding change in nonmetropolitan American society. It can be noted that this paradigm, or some variation of it, is not uncommon in descriptions of change in an urban setting. It is less often applied to the rural context. Our use of

[1] See James H. Copp (ed.), Our Changing Rural Society (Ames: Iowa State University Press, 1964), for a collection of essays on change in rural society, particularly Robin Williams Jr., "American Society in Transition: Trends and Emerging Developments in Social and Cultural Systems," and Olaf F. Larson and Everett Rogers, "Rural Society in Transition: The American Setting."

it will therefore accent our point that at least at a generalized level the same basic processes are operative in both sectors of society. Further, the discussion will point out, as a second part of our focus, certain manifestations of these processes which are unique to rural society, and subsequent strains they cause within the rural social system. Finally it will be suggested that rural society through its participation in these processes is moving toward greater openness and diversity.

DEMOGRAPHIC STABILITY TO DEMOGRAPHIC MOBILITY. We are all well aware that American society has become highly mobile. This mobility, or population movement, has left a definite mark on rural society. In broad terms, the rural population has suffered sharp losses through outward migration, especially in those rural areas in the interior part of the country. In terms of towns and cities, Bogue and Beale have noted that cities with populations of from 10, 000 to 25, 000, from 25, 000 to 50, 000, and from 50, 000 to 100, 000 grew most rapidly between the years 1950 to 1960. Towns of 10, 000 population or less suffered a different trend: "Towns of 2, 000 to 5, 000 people experienced some absolute growth of population as a group but declined relatively. The population in places of less than 2, 000 dropped slightly (even when the urban suburbs are included) and the proportionate importance of such communities fell sharply."[2]

In terms of counties, "the metropolitan counties number less than twelve percent of the total number of counties, yet eighty-four percent of the nation's population growth in the 1950's occurred within them."[3]

This pattern of population shift takes on more significance when we recognize that out-migration has been represented increasingly by young people moving to the cities. Thus communities which may be sharing a temporary increase in overall population at the moment may later face a grim future if the present out-migration of its youth continues.

Beyond this group, the loss has been sustained primarily among farmers, and largely among men engaged in farming small sized farms.

---

[2]Donald J. Bogue and Clavin L. Beale, "Recent Population Trends in the United States and Their Causes," in Copp, op. cit., p. 85.

[3]Ibid., pp. 85-87. See also Marvin Judy, The Cooperative Parish in Nonmetropolitan Areas (New York: Abingdon Press, 1967), for a discussion of population drifts and their significance.

This loss has occurred as a result of the increase in mechanization and the decrease in the number of small farms. Needless to say, the loss of farm families inevitably leaves its mark on business in the small town community, as well as other institutions including the church.

Population mobility in the rural area is marked by the emergence of three types of communities which we can in a general fashion designate the dying community, the stabilized community, and the growing community. The dying community is essentially one in which loss of population, either gradual or sharp, is marking the end of its life. It is not difficult to recognize the crisis faced by such a community on both a psychological and sociological level. The young leave, business places are boarded up, social organizations diminish in size or cease to exist, the railroad station is torn down, and the community takes on a general tone of defeat. The problem that then looms largest becomes that of learning how to die gracefully.

The second, the stabilized community, is transitional in nature. It is stable in the sense that population increases from within through births, or from without through in-migration which thereby checks the outflow. But this is only temporary, for the community through its own institutional vigor will either grow or diminish in size. It is in this type of community that the social and economic choices become so paramount, for there is at least in an ideal sense the alternative of moving in either direction.

The third type of community is the growing community. It may well have a high rate of population outflow, but in-migration not only balances the outflow but exceeds it. In such towns the increase comes primarily from the dying communities which lie within its trading sphere. In other communities the increase is due to attractions normally economic in nature or geographical as is true of towns near metropolitan areas. In some respects the greatest degree of dislocation and strain occurs in this type of community where, for example, schools, law enforcement agencies, and public facilities may be taxed. The extent and effect of such strain are dependent upon the rate and cause of the population increase and the ability of the community to constructively and efficiently respond as a social, political, and economic unit.

The nonmetropolitan community, therefore, like the metropolitan, is experiencing population mobility and the effects of such mobility. It is a mark of its social existence.

HOMOGENEITY TO HETEROGENEITY. This process by which a community becomes less homogeneous and more heterogeneous is related

to the above and deserves only brief mention. Urban life has experienced heterogenization because of its changing and increasing population. The nonmetropolitan areas are only beginning to feel the full impact of this change. The point that needs to be made here is that growth in small communities will normally modify homogeneous patterns. For as a town diversifies its economic and demographic structure by attracting businesses and employees from other regions, the pluralistic character of the community will be extended. In effect, the social base will be broadened. The community failing to recognize this may experience strain, over and above that which might have been expected.

INDEPENDENCE TO INTERDEPENDENCE. A third process of change is the broad-based shift from a more independent to a more interdependent relationship with the larger society. This process is reflected in the shift away from a more autonomous, self-sustained community life, to a state of social interdependence with other communities in such areas as politics, economics, and education. Larson and Rogers in an essay on "Rural Society in Transition" have explored this interdependence at an economic level in their analysis of change in the farm community. They have suggested that linkages between the farm and non-farm sectors have increased in terms of the farmers who have sought and found non-farm work to supplement income. "Thus the occupational roles of farmers have been changing and their linkage with the non-farm economy and with non-farm-oriented social systems has been increasing."[4] We could add to this the increasing tendency of wives to seek employment in non-farm work.

A second linkage has come with "the increasing dependence of farmers on agribusinessmen to supply input resources for the farm firm."[5]

A third linkage is that of increasing contract farming and vertical integration where certain levels of management and production are shared with other groups such as buyers, suppliers, or in-farm cooperatives. This links the process of farming itself with other farm enterprises and non-farm institutions.[6]

---

[4] Larson and Rogers, op. cit., p. 48.

[5] Ibid., p. 49.

[6] Ibid., p. 50.

A fourth example refers to the farmer's broadening contact and relationship with nonlocal agencies such as those of government and farm industries. Thus action in Washington or the state capitol has immediate local implications, and through farm organizations farmers attempt to influence these governmental decisions.

These linkages also indicate increasing complexity and specialization. The process of interdependence in part allows for a greater degree of specialization as well as necessitating it in certain cases. The very fact of linkage implies increased complexity as management and production procedures, employment relationships, and relationships to nonlocal organizations become more and more differentiated.

Such linkages can be traced in other spheres of rural life. The point to be made is that this growing network of relationships so firmly links the rural with the broader society that its goals and destiny are linked to what occurs in society at large. In very general terms this process may occur relatively smoothly. What has to be acknowledged, however, is that its effect on specific families and institutions may be quite profound. New role-demands that are often difficult to understand and threaten older patterns of personal and social interaction, are required; in many cases role-displacements occur, rendering activities and attitudes meaningless that were once crucial to the maintenance of the community's life. Certainly the possible role of the church in helping the community to interpret the transition as well as helping to guide it has been all too often ignored.

LOCALIZED AUTHORITY TO CENTRALIZED AUTHORITY. A fourth fundamental process of change has been that of the movement from local authority to more centralized authority in decision making. This was touched upon in the above discussion with regard to the linkages of farmers with centralized bureaucratic agencies which lie beyond the perimeters of the community, and in many cases beyond the state and region. This process of centralization has also taken place in the political sphere. Small town governments have sharply felt the influence of nonlocal government agencies which are often involved in making dominant decisions affecting the economic and social destiny of the community. Determination of transportation routes is one such example, as well as the locating of public institutions and government agencies which often represent major employers in small towns. Small town government has for the most part never been a strong governing unit. Its powers have usually been limited and diffuse, with real political power often resting in the hands of a single family, a single industry, a clique, or in shifting coalitions. Thus the shift of certain

types of political decisions to nonlocal centralized agencies has been for the most part predictable. It has made the local political structures even more ineffective than they were in an earlier period, however, and narrowed opportunity for meaningful participation in social and political decision making on the part of the local citizenry.[7]

The process of centralization in education has been a phenomenon of major import. Often the school system of a community has constituted a primary source of revenue, social and cultural activities, and professional leadership. With school consolidation this has meant the loss of a school for some communities and gain of one for others. Its effects on a town have therefore often been crucial. A second expression of the process has been related to decision making regarding the nature and quality of education, for nonlocal county and state boards of education have assumed primary roles in the determination of educational standards. This has been necessary in order to equalize the quality of education throughout a state. But it has resulted in the further loss of decision-making power which once rested in local hands.

The centralization of agribusiness has also meant a wide range of decision making occurring beyond the local business unit, often in national headquarters far removed from the local community.

Centralized authority has in many cases resulted in basic upgrading in the political, social, educational, and economic life of the small community. It has also posed the problem, as has been suggested, of how local citizens can continue to participate meaningfully in decisions which affect them so directly. This problem is merely intensified in many areas where the political ideology borders more on the Jeffersonian model of democracy than that of a planned and regulated social system. In such areas the search for intermediary structures and associations which can help maintain channels whereby reciprocity may occur in the

---

[7]See William J. Gore and Leroy C. Hodapp (eds.), Change in the Small Community. (New York: Friendship Press, 1967), for two essays dealing with political power and change in the small community: Sheldon Lowry and John Mitchell, "Distribution of Social Power in Small Communities," and Bert Swanson, "Political Change in Small American Community." See also Arthur Vidich and Joseph Bensman, Small Town in Mass Society (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1960), for a case study of the political clique in a small town. This book is a classic in the study of small communities.

decision-making process becomes crucial. Such associations require development, leadership, participation that have not been the mark of the more loosely structured, family oriented small community. Indeed, local associations with prescribed purposes utilizing bureaucratic techniques in planning and implementation have often been regarded with suspicion. In sum, the restructuring of small communities in order that they can better relate to and participate in bureaucratic decision making affecting their lives is not easy. Rural communities cling to structures that are often outmoded, such as county government, or to modes that are irrelevant such as most small town forms of government.

The need to understand and respond creatively to the process of centralization is essential, for basic questions of authority, social cohesion, community identification, and meaningful participation are at issue and these represent the very fibers of community structure.

PAROCHIALISM TO COSMOPOLITANISM. In this shift toward greater cosmopolitanism we have individuals becoming more aware of issues beyond the local farm and community, identifying with these issues and involving themselves in them. In sum, cosmopolitanism represents a shift in orientation from a more parochial locus to a broader, more comprehensive perspective. [8]

The degree to which a person is cosmopolitan depends on a complex range of factors, including education, affluence, travel, or geographical location. No doubt the mass media, the automobile, and nonlocal trading centers have been important in developing and maintaining this shift. This change does not come easily. In one sense it means a broadening of scope beyond the local units of activity and loyalty, and such units as the family and local community do not lose loyalties without strain.

In the process it is not unusual to find two different, excessive responses. The first is reactionary. The individual in the face of cosmopolitan issues draws back and subsequently seeks to sink more deeply into parochial traditions and concerns. The result is a person or community that fears outside contact and avoids outside influence. It is not difficult to see the import of this attitude in dealing with the above processes of change. In effect it is a futile escapist route that leaves the community, which desparately needs to become more open, closed to actions that could save it.

---

[8] Larson and Rogers, op. cit., p. 55.

The second response is one in which the individual so identifies with issues beyond the local scene that he takes little interest or action on behalf of the community. Rural towns near cities which become "bedroom" suburbs have long experienced the dilemma of this type of individual as its citizen. This individual also escapes dealing with issues facing the community, not by sinking into parochialism but by fleeing into an abstract cosmopolitanism which is equally devastating to a struggling community.

ATOMISTIC INDIVIDUALISM TO RELATIONAL INDIVIDUALISM. This shift represents an ideological change in which there occurs a reordering within the cultural value system of the primary value orientation towards individualism. There is a move away from the notion of the rugged individualistic pioneer who is free and autonomous and capable of carving his own world out of wilderness. It moves toward a notion of the individual as essentially involved with his neighbor in a common destiny and indeed dependent upon relationships as prior conditions for becoming and remaining a person with dignity. [9]

There is strain created in this shift too, for the ideological myth of atomistic individualism has lain buried most deeply in the soul of the American, and its reorientation is all too painful to the plainsman still fascinated with American romanticism.

GEMEINSCHAFT TO GESELLSCHAFT. The final process of change can be expressed by the categories of Gemeinschaft (community) and Gesellschaft (society). The concepts were developed by Ferdinand Tönnies in the nineteenth century as a typology for describing fundamental types of social organization. [10] Gemeinschaft implied a focus on primary informal and often diffuse relationships such as those we experience in the family and in friendships. Great significance is given to the affective dimension of the relationship, and it may be considered at least in part as an end in itself.

---

[9]See John Brewster, "Rural Values and Beliefs," in E. W. Mueller and Giles Ekola (eds.), The Silent Struggle for Mid-America. (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1963). This essay discusses the "work ethic," the "democratic creed," and the "enterprise creed," all of which are related to the fundamental value of individualism.

[10]Ferdinand Tönnies, Community and Society, tr. Charles Loomis (N. Y.: Harper, 1963).

Gesellschaft type relationships are specific rather than diffuse, with definite ends in mind. They are contractual in nature and carry very little affective weight one way or the other. The business transaction is such a relationship. This shift from one type of social organization to another is inevitable in a society which is increasingly engaged in secondary relationships such as those involved in bureaucratic organizations, cosmopolitan involvements, and mass communication. It increases in a community where the influx of new ideas, individuals, and institutions brings the need for more formal and impersonal patterns of relationship.

The strain in the rural social system has been and will continue to be greatest in this shift where it affects the role of family and community patterns of "neighborliness." On the one hand, familial authority and neighborly interaction with their appeal to tradition, familiarity, and consensus can no longer serve as primary models for the major forms of social and economic interaction in a community. On the other hand, the family will have placed upon it a greater burden of maintaining the personal, affective life of the individual, since public institutions will become more impersonal in their form of social organization. This may well mean that the community will need to explore new forms of communally oriented groups to help share this responsibility, as well as ways of helping meet problems which occur in families as a consequence of additional strains. Certainly the church could play an important role in both encouraging the development of such groups as well as providing such groups within its own structure.

This treatment of the processes of change picks up only a few of the specific issues faced by the small community, but it hopefully does suggest a framework for appreciating major directions of change in rural society. In a summary statement of social scientific finds on the small community, William Gore has suggested in four basic points what we feel is the direction of the processes we have been examining:

> What the social scientist has found indicates that there are some things we can assert: First, the stability of the closed system that was the traditional rural community no longer exists. Second, there is an almost universal ambivalence toward change on the part of the residents of small communities; they have benefited as well as suffered from what has transpired during the past fifty years. Third, there is an expectation that pressures for change will continue to impinge on the community and

> that this will result in an increasing dependence on bureaucratic arrangements. Fourth, there is little question but that the rate of urban-rural interpenetration will increase in the future. There seems to be every reason to expect that on this point the past has in fact been prologue to the future. [11]

In sum, what we have attempted to suggest is that rural society is moving in the direction of a more open society. Mobility, heterogeneity, interdependence, centralization of authority, cosmopolitanism, and Gesellschaft type characteristics all signify the movement.

Further, these processes are not unique to the rural sector any more than they are unique to the urban setting. They are rather the processes of change affecting the society as a whole. They may be manifested differently in the country than in the city, but even then the fundamental dynamics remain the same. Indeed, even specific problems of the small town and city neighborhood share similar motifs: the uprooting of traditional patterns of thinking and living, the loss of a sense of meaningful participation in social, political, and economic decision making, the need for exploring new types of associational and communal structure for responding to social change.

The processes are all interrelated, and change in one area invites change in others. Strain is greatest when the sequence of change set off by some particular process does not result in an adequate change at other levels. Thus when the myth of rugged individualism remains an informing value in the midst of a movement toward greater interdependence and centralization it becomes increasingly difficult to grapple realistically and creatively with the issues that emerge.

The task, then, for society as a whole is that of identifying and responding creatively to this change however and wherever it may express itself. As a participant, the church has a responsibility to help make that response creative. To do this, however, it must take seriously the structures it needs to accomplish this task. It is to a consideration of these structures that our attention needs now to turn.

---

[11] William J. Gore, "An Overview of Social Science Perspectives," in Gore and Hodapp, op. cit., p. 31.

Mission and the Church's Roles

In turning to a consideration of the church's response to change in small town America, we understandably turn to the question of the church's mission. Perhaps no subject in either the Roman Catholic Church or the Protestant Churches is receiving more attention at so many levels as is this subject. It is "the issue of the moment." Our treatment therefore can afford to be selective with a focus on particular dimensions of the question. We shall not attempt to develop or justify a theology of mission, nor shall we attempt to program the church's mission for a changing small town society. What we shall do after making certain basic comments about the nature of the church's mission is to focus on what the church needs to do structurally in order that it can as an institution respond to its mission imperatives -- what it needs to do in order that it can become the most viable instrument of mission.

In this consideration we shall focus on three questions. First, what are the viable structural roles the church can play in fulfilling its mission? Secondly, what conditions must be present within the church for these roles to be fulfilled? And thirdly, what are the levels of ecumenical involvement that might be created in order to fulfill the church's mission more adequately? In exploring for answers to each of these questions we shall again take into consideration certain myths which have tended to stymie a significant examination of these questions.

In beginning our discussion I would like to set forth briefly certain premises regarding the mission of the church in the present age.

Central to this mission is the fact that the Christian is called to engage the world in dialogue for the purpose of understanding the world's needs and responding to those needs wherever they may exist and in whatever fashion they may present themselves.[12] In concrete terms this means that the mission of the local church is to respond not only to the congregation it serves but also to the community in the midst of which it exists; that it must accept the call to grapple with the issues whether they be social or economic, political or personal, whenever the dehumanization and distortion of God's creation are involved. It means

---

[12]See articles 4 and 40 of the "Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World" of Vatican II for statements which embody this basic idea.

that the church must be ever responsive to the fundamental reality that it is foremost an instrument for God's judging and reconciling action in the world.

Given this view of mission, it is necessary for the institutional structures of the church to be flexible in nature. Particularly is this true of the structural roles it defines and utilizes in fulfilling its goals, for the church can attempt to respond to a wide range of diverse issues only if it can play a diverse number of roles that are oriented toward both the personal and social spheres of reality. Here again we are faced with a myth which hinders an adequate appreciation of such flexibility. This myth we can label "the myth of the unchanging role of the church." It assumes that the church basically has one fundamental role and that is the role of pastoral care to individuals in the congregation. This care is normally expressed by a one to one priest-parishioner relationship. It is the individual who is to be nurtured and to whom the structures of the church are to be oriented. Underlying this view is a narrow concept of mission in which the individual rather than society as a whole is considered the object of the church's concern.

The problem with this myth is that insofar as it does inform the thinking of a local parish, it tends to hinder the demand that the church should become open to the needs of the community at large; it tends to limit any realistic assessment of what roles the church can and ought to play in the life of a community. In response to the myth, I should like to suggest that there does exist a wide range of viable roles which the church is responsible for fulfilling and that the church should be open to playing as many of these roles as demanded by the situation.

These roles are oriented specifically toward response to the community, though I would add that this is by no means a displacement of the pastoral-care role which is crucial in the life of any church. What these roles do is extend the reach of the church to the total community which is equally crucial if it is to be effective beyond its own walls. Given, then, this prologue, the following paradigm of roles is suggested as basic in the church's response to its community.[13]

---

[13]See Joseph Fichter, Social Relations in the Urban Parish (University of Chicago Press, 1954), ch. 10, for a discussion of social roles of the parish priest. His discussion examines the definition and structure of roles in a parish.

A first and fundamental role that the church should be willing to play is that of community analyzer. This is a role the church has played throughout history, though it has not always been self-consciously aware of doing so. From our standpoint, the task is basically one of analyzing the patterns of community change and offering both an ethical and theological response to this change.

The first level of analysis is empirical in nature. At this level an attempt is made to determine as objectively as possible what changes are taking place and what the immediate as well as long range effects will be on the community. Such an analysis may involve determining what the population patterns of the community are. Is it gaining or losing population? Is a healthy balance of age groupings being maintained or not? Or, it may necessitate an analysis of the economic life of the community. If farming is the primary industry, is it growing or declining? Are there fewer farms? What are the strains which farm families are facing? Depending upon the situation in the town, the analysis may involve an exploration of the long range educational opportunities that will be available; the cosmopolitanism of the community; the ability of organizational structures present in the community for dealing with the problems created by change.

Such an analysis may mean engaging outside help, though churches within their own membership often have talented persons capable of directing a study of a community and its issues. Furthermore, much of the type of information needed has already been gathered by private and public agencies. Thus the task of the church may be more that of seeing that the data is brought together and made available.

The second level is that of ethical analysis. The church must here isolate the ethical implications of changes which are taking place. Furthermore, it has a primary task of teaching people both inside and outside the church how to reason ethically about the issues affecting them. There may have been a time in which the broad issues could be thought through by the church and answered for the people. That day no longer exists. People are constantly being confronted by a continuing stream of new situations. The church, therefore, must equip people with a method for responding as ethicists.

The third level is that of theological analysis. Here, too, the church has the task of providing a theological background for understanding the issues affecting us. To be able to reflect theologically about these issues presupposes having learned how to relate them to a theological understanding of God, man, nature. The task of the church is, then, to provide an opportunity for learning how to do this. For example, with

regard to the emerging process of human interdependence which is re-defining our view of man's relationship to his world, there is a real need to understand the theological significance of that image. The church, therefore, must help the individual learn how to probe such an image with theological questions and see what relationship exists between it and a Christian doctrine of man. In both the ethical and theological task, then, the church is charged with the responsibility not only of offering ethical and theological judgments, but also of offering a method of ethical and theological analysis which can be learned and employed by the people themselves.

The second role is that of community interpreter. Crucial to any analysis such as the one suggested above is the need to interpret to the congregation and larger community what it has learned. The church should take responsibility along with other institutions in explaining the changes that are taking place and what effect they have on the community. In this role, interpretation should include a consideration of local issues as well as those which affect the broader society. In other words, the church has the responsibility in the small community of relating its own situation and local crises to those of the larger society. This is an important dimension of the interpreter's role, for it helps eliminate a purely parochial perspective and concern for community problems.

A third role is that of sustainer. In this role the church has the task of reaffirming what in the community is basically and fundamentally sound and should be held up as a dominant motif or pattern of behavior. This must be done with care and only after having assessed what empirically contributes to the well-being of the community and is feasible as a continuing element within the system. Unless this is done, the church will fall into the trap of approving what ought to be changed.

There is also the task of sustaining individuals by helping them to gain perspective regarding changes occurring within their own lives--a perspective which will give them freedom to assess and to absorb the effect of change itself. Here the church's own unique ability to provide individuals and groups with a transcendental referent point from which social phenomena can be interpreted and judged is of paramount importance.

A fourth role is that of reconciler. Through this role the task of reconciliation is undertaken in the face of social strife and conflict. This role is not simple. It may necessitate taking part in the conflict in order that the church's offices can become available for the healing of personal and social disruption. It may require becoming an arbitrator for conflicting groups or an advocate for a particular party. Like the other roles it demands an understanding of the issues. Blind attempts

at reconciliation are an invitation to deepening conflict, not its resolution.

A fifth role is that of catalyst. This role implies a willingness to start action in order that the need for response from appropriate groups can be made evident. For example, the church's response to the poor, the young or the elderly may mean not only pointing out the dilemmas they face but also responding with specific programs that would later be taken over by other organizations or groups within the community. The key is to see that the programs undertaken are in fact assumed by other persons or agencies, for the thrust of this role is to raise the question of social responsibility and to move the community into responsible action.

A significant and essential role is that of the prophet -- the reformer and critic. It is not an easy role to play. It involves the type of action such as that taken by Fr. Groppi and Dr. Martin Luther King, who raised the issues and kept them before us until we were forced to respond. It is a role that may require criticism of normative patterns of behavior which deny the rights of new people to be accepted into a community. It may require the criticism of a community for its failure to act for its own preservation. It may mean demanding that people recognize their responsibility to provide a humanizing climate for all groups of a community. Above all it requires the use of strategy and demands a willingness on the part of its participants to accept conflict and respond to it.

A further role is that of community creator. This takes two forms. First, the church has a responsibility -- perhaps more now than ever before -- of providing new forms of community which invite depth relationships in sharing and growing. The communal role may not have been as important in the past, since the neighborhood and the family provided the essential communality. That situation is now shifting as communities experience the effects of change. For example, families are no longer extended families but nuclear in structure, children become involved in a multitude of activities that take them away from the family unit, and vocational involvements result in a range of nonlocal contacts. Thus, secondary relationships have replaced many of the primary relationships of an earlier period. The need for new types of community which will provide opportunities for exploring the personal and social dimensions of relationships is becoming greater. One of the fundamental tasks of the church, therefore, is to rethink its own understanding of community and to develop more dynamic forms of communal interaction.

Secondly, the church has the task of creating community organizations which will assume responsibility for meeting particular needs.

It may create or encourage the creation of new voluntary associations where they are needed, or strengthen those that already exist. Particularly is this important in light of changes in political and economic structures which have tended to reduce the opportunity for citizens to participate meaningfully in the decision making that affects the life of the community. This involvement in community organization may be catalytic in nature or more long range, depending on the nature of the need and the church's ability.

A final role is that of priest. Here the church has the basic task of relating its own action and the experience of its members to the will of God. The fundamental locus for this is worship. It is in the worship of a church that its basic symbols are acknowledged, participated in, and reaffirmed. In terms of the community as a whole the church in fulfilling this role attempts to relate the life of the community itself to its ultimate source.

These are the basic roles of the church in the life of the community. They are the structural roles through which the church's mission can be accomplished. They do not define the substantive form of the mission of the church, nor do they define the specific action to be taken in a particular situation. They rather lie between the substantive formulation of mission and its actual implementation as the structural roles through which this mission is channeled into action.

The significance of giving this extended consideration is precisely that of suggesting that if a church is to take seriously the task of discerning and implementing its mission, then it must look at the structural roles through which that mission can move from idea to action, and more specifically it must be open to the realization that there exist different types of roles, each of which can provide a somewhat different means for expressing the church's mission. The myth which maintains that there is somehow one fundamental role of the church oriented toward the individual in the congregation is thus inadequate. It does not allow for the diversity of roles necessary for the fulfillment of a mission which requires a dynamic engagement of the church with its world.

Given this view that the roles of the church must be recognized in determining how mission shall be actualized, we are faced with a further question -- whether conditions necessary for fulfilling these roles are present. To answer this question requires an examination of the church's capability to perform in such a fashion as to achieve its goals. Here again an inherited myth is operative which acts to hinder such a process of analysis and examination. We shall call it "the myth of the non-analyzable church." Essentially the myth posits that we do not analyze

and critically examine the church, for the church is a sacred institution which is to be accepted as given. Needless to say, Vatican II cuts across this notion, but it still remains operative as an informing myth for many parishioners.

The practical problem with the myth is that it denies the need for a local parish to examine the operation of the church as an institution with the type of concerted analytical effort that is needed. What we propose is a practical response to the myth in the form of a model for determining whether the roles through which mission is to be channeled are likely to be allowed to function adequately. The model includes four conditions which must exist for the roles to be effective.

First, the mission of the church must be well defined in terms of specific goals which are to be achieved. When these mission goals are inadequately defined, the determination of the roles to be played is difficult and confusing. Secondly, there must exist both cooperation and commitment to the fulfillment of particular goals, and this cooperation and commitment must be maintained through periods of strain or the execution of specific roles will fail in midstream. Thirdly, the church must have the resources necessary for fulfilling its goals and be able to make them available. In brief, it is necessary that the church be able to make accessible such resources as money, plant, parish organizations, and talents. The fourth condition is related to theological values. It is essential that particular goals have theological legitimation and that the ongoing life of the church be vital enough to maintain this legitimation, or the roles themselves will never be accepted.

In attempting to assess a church's capacity to play vital roles in the life of its community it should raise basic questions as to whether these conditions are present and if not whether they can be created. In turn, where roles are functioning inadequately, one way of locating the reason for such dysfunction is through an examination of each of these conditions.

The church which finds its basic mission efforts failing may find that the problem rests with an inadequate theological rationale and concern on the part of the congregation, or the lack of cooperation necessary for cohesive action. Or it may have a very sound theological undergirding with enthusiastic commitment but lack the ability to adapt its resources so that action will take place. Needless to say, to isolate a problem is not to solve it, but it is the first step. To isolate and assess such problems requires the recognition on the part of the congregation that such analysis is permissible. In effect, the church must be seen as an institution which can be subject to rigorous analysis.

The Church and Its Ecumenical Involvements

A further area of institutional analysis comes in the reassessing of the church's ecumenical relationships. We live today in a world in which cooperation is an imperative, not a luxury. The rural crisis needs the concerted response of all churches, not the competitive responses of self-concerned institutions. The crisis needs churches that have accepted the challenge and are working in the light of their commonality.

In the following discussion a paradigm is given for assessing levels of ecumenical involvements and determining the directions for the extension of such involvements. In the literature on ecumenical relations, involvement is often presented in rather static models.[14] Churches are offered single packages which would link them in single types of relationships. What is being proposed here is that churches can operate at different levels of involvement with each other or as a group. Furthermore, a church can move from one level to another as new opportunities and situations allow.

The first level is that of parallel cooperation in which we have both complementary and supplementary relationships. Church A recognizes that Church B is performing a particular service in the community. So it does not attempt to set up a competing program; rather, it encourages the continuation of an existing one. In effect, churches recognize each other's capacities and programs and attempt to complement what already exists rather than enter into basic competition.

Or, moving along the continuum we may have supplementary cooperation. At this level we actually share staff or lay leadership or a program with other churches. Church A has a unique facility and location for conducting youth programs, while Church B has exceptional leadership. Therefore let Church A offer its facilities and B its leadership for the development of special programs.

---

[14]See David Bell, et. al., Ecumenical Designs (National Consultation on the Church in Community Life, 1967), for a presentation of ecumenical models. This book is helpful in defining many of the present types of ecumenical involvements. But it still deals with static models rather than process models in which different churches can be seen to be cooperating at different levels of relationship as they move towards corporateness.

A second major level is joint cooperation. This refers to specific projects in which churches cooperate for the accomplishment of particular goals. For example, churches may wish to make a joint analysis of social change and its issues within the community or they may join in a common project for meeting particular community needs or make joint statements about ethical issues facing the town.

The third level may be called limited corporateness. It is at this point that churches actually relinquish individual control over a particular program. For example, let us suppose there are three churches, each of which has a weak christian education program. In order to strengthen their programs they create a board made up of people from each of the churches which is responsible for Christian education in all three churches. This means that they actually have an autonomous board supported by the three churches, though controlled by no single one of them. This board will then attempt to plan and execute programming in the area of education. We can extend this kind of involvement to other areas of church life to include a whole range of programs where churches will give up a certain degree of their autonomy and commission a board or an organization to speak and work for all of them.

The final level of involvement is that of complete corporateness or organic union. This may develop from successful attempts at the above levels of involvement, or from initial negotiations between bodies.

What can be said for this approach is that churches can cooperate on several different levels at the same time. A church may work with Church A in terms of parallel cooperation in dealing with ministry to the elderly. It may enter into joint cooperation with Church B in dealing with community needs, and it may operate at a limited level of corporateness in youth programming with both Churches A and B. Churches have a responsibility in the face of social change to explore all possible levels of involvement. They have the choice of beginning at one level and moving on to another. The point is at least to begin.

Rural society is changing and in that process faces a crisis of identity and destiny. The objective of this discussion has been to acknowledge that fact and insist that the church too must change to meet the challenge. This is not easy. It requires a willingness to examine how the parish should function: how it should relate to itself, its fellow Christian bodies and the community in which it exists.

The church in a small town is, at a quite basic level, a building which can well know, as can the town, the harsh reality of boarded windows and rotting walls. Thus the destiny of the small town and its churches is irrevocably charted on the same course. At a perhaps theologically more justifiable level the destiny of the church as an instrument of God in the world rests on responding to the crisis of the towns and the churches. Let us hope that the church chooses well its course of action.

2. THE RURAL SYSTEM AS AN IDEAL MODEL

George A. Donohue and Edward Gross

The classical model of rural society has served sociologists much as the classical model in economics served economists. It has provided a background, a bench mark against which all social change may be measured. Though useful as an ideal type, the classical model of rural social organization has become an idealized model to many in sociology. Instead of serving as a point from which to measure change, it has become a standard against which change may be evaluated. However useful the concepts of that model may have been in understanding and analyzing systems of social organization and possible future systems, it is static and descriptive by nature.

The classical rural model as used in most rural sociological literature is a special case limited to the United States: diversified agriculture of a subsistence nature, isolated farmsteads, individually owned or managed. The concepts of individualism, independence, responsibility and human rights were operationally perceived within the confines of the model. Independence meant self-sufficiency, individuality meant being a personality among personalities -- not a person among persons -- and one's rights were co-extensive with one's property ownership. The social organization of the period was based on man's relationship to land rather than man's relationship to man as defined via an abstract concept of man as a participant in the social system.

The midwestern nature of the model not only prevented an adequate understanding of the social organization of cities, but also hindered the making of regional and international comparisons. The urban organization as well as corporate farming in the rural sector were viewed not so much as differentiation of social forms, but rather as deviations from the ideal. It has been as difficult for the sociologist steeped in the classical rural model to accept collective bargaining as a form of social organization associated with work as it has been for the classical economist to accept services as an economic good. The problems of the laborer in the city, as well as the migratory laborer in the large-scale, west coast farms, were not conceived of as problems of social organization -- of man's relationship to man -- but rather as a social welfare problem, an undesirable consequence of deviation from the idealized model.

The current situation in much of midwestern rural society has resulted in little adaptation of the model to changing conditions of production. The reason is that, although there has been a tremendous increase of specialization in farm products as well as an increase in size of farms, the vast majority of farmers and small town businessmen are still owners or managers. To that extent, the system meets the basic requirements of the model for determining man's relationship to man. However, about 20 percent of the farm producers contribute approximately 79 percent of the commercially saleable products; and only 4 percent of all persons employed in areas outside of the large metropolitan cities derive their income from self-employment and as such constitute a minority of the membership of our rural social organization.[1]

The model assumed a type of agricultural fundamentalism not only because of the fact that food and fiber are necessary to sustenance and survival, but also because of an implied superior merit of this form of organization. Yet, while efficient agricultural production and its organization are necessary prerequisites to urbanization and industrialization, the question of whether the structure of that organization, including its value orientation, is either necessary to or sufficient for the development of urbanization and industrialization should hardly be assumed as theoretically given.

The general adherence to the classical model during early urban organization retarded considerably the development of alternative social structures in which the values of independence, individuality, thrift, industry, and responsibility could be realized. The growth of the urban social system appears more as a product of lay social movements and humanist philosophy than of intellectual input from rural sociologists on the nature of social organization, its elements and its functional integration. This was so because the rural model was essentially a description of a particular form of organization, rather than a theoretical frame for the analysis of social organization. The empirical studies of communities by rural sociologists were used in developing new frames of reference; however, the primary theoretical syntheses by others

---

[1]U. S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 48, "Income in 1964 of Families and Unrelated Individuals by Metropolitan and Nonmetropolitan Residence" (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 6.

using these data have been relatively gross departures from the traditional rural model of social organization, for it is doubtful that the classical model any longer applies even in rural society at the present time.

The current situation reveals growing discrepancies between rural and urban areas as measured by the objective indices relating to health, education, housing, income, and other measures of the level of living. There is a recognition of the fact that the homogeneity of interests that once characterized the rural system is, therefore, no longer a valid condition of the model. As the recent National Food and Fiber Commission's report [2] indicates, the time has come when clearly different policies must be directed and designed for commercial agriculture, while others must be designed to deal with other segments in rural areas. Analyses and solutions for one sector have no particular significance to the other. Indeed, this indicates that any model of rural social organization must take into account the heterogeneity and conflicting interests that have developed in rural America. Rural social organization can no longer be considered as a general model, but rather as a special case of the interdependence model that characterizes the urban sector. In order to understand the shape of current social organization, we must, therefore, turn to an examination of urban patterns and seek to understand their relevance for a new model of rural society.

Growing Interdependence through Industrialization

Throughout the period we have been describing, new types of organization, based on new forms of interdependence were developing in urban areas. These new forms owed much to industrialization and the growth of corporate forms of organization. Individual forms increased greatly in size as the advantages of scale made themselves evident to entrepreneurs. In the United States, at the present time, although some three-quarters of private firms are small (employing fewer than seven workers per firm), all of these firms put together employ about one-seventh of all employees. By contrast, firms with over 500 employees each make up only three-tenths of one percent of all firms; yet they employ over one-fourth of all workers. Firms with over fifty employees make up

[2] Food and Fiber for the Future, Report of the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967).

only 3.4 percent of all firms, but together they employ nearly two-thirds of all the workers.[3]

But it is not size as such that is significant. Rather the large corporate form of organization has taken on new functions and become the basic economic planning unit in our society. With ownership dispersed among a large group of stockholders, the managers of corporations assume predominate control to the point of being able to choose their own board of directors. With no single entrepreneur or small group of powerful owners to contend with, managers pursue their own goals which are not necessarily those of profit maximization. Profit maximization, while acceptable if other goals are not threatened, is not in itself a goal attractive to the managers, since they do not share in these profits unless they themselves participate in the ownership of the company. Rather, the goals of the managers are those of maintaining a sufficient profit or keeping earnings at a level sufficiently high to enable the managers to maintain their own autonomy through keeping creditors and investors satisfied.

Once managers secure their autonomy, they are able to go about their major task which is that of reducing risks to the firm's survival through planning. As Galbraith[4] has pointed out, this takes a variety of forms: namely, vertical integration, the manipulation of consumer demand, and the limitation of competition through the development of oligopolistic structures. The result is that the competitive market is finally replaced by the guaranteed market. The firms in this market -- perhaps instead of "firms" they should be called "supercorporations" -- find they cannot, however, control all major variables. In particular, they cannot provide the basic education that a disciplined labor supply requires; and, however much they can control demand for their own products, they cannot control aggregate demand. For these essential services, they hold the state responsible. Those activities of the state, along with its role as major purchaser of goods and services and as major subsidizer of the more costly forms of basic research, make it increasingly difficult to draw the line between the private and public sectors.

---

[3]Figures calculated from data provided in County Business Patterns, First Quarter, Part 1, U. S. Summary, tables 1A and 1C, Bureau of the Census (1962).

[4]John K. Galbraith, The New Industrial State (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1967), ch. 1 - 3 and passim.

Structural Differentiations in Process

Agriculture has been able only to a limited extent to participate in the corporate form described here. This fact is illustrated by the GLF, IGA, and NFO. Partly this consequence was related to the fact that even the very large farm is small by industrial standards and also because many forms of farming admit of only limited control of their planning, for the reasons familiar to all students of agriculture. It must, however, be added that the corporate form itself was not regarded as a desirable model to follow by many farmers because of the tendency of farming to be associated with the set of values which held that there was something sacred about farming, that it was no mere occupation but a stewardship.

However, the increasing risks to which commercialized farming was subject, as it found itself tied to the administered prices of the products which it needed, especially farm equipment, while its control over its own prices was not correspondingly increased, led the farmer to turn to his only major source of stabilizing his future -- parity and other types of support and guarantees from the Federal Government. Agriculture found federal interest receptive, in part because there had been an interest in agriculture from the beginning, inasmuch as most people were engaged in agriculture. As society became diversified and the proportions of those in farming decreased both relatively and absolutely, agriculture found that it had become a special interest among the special interests. It need hardly be added that in expecting that the Federal Government shall assume a major share of the task of reducing risks and providing minimum guarantees, agriculture is not different from the supercorporations described above. The government's role, as symbolized in the Employment Act of 1946, is simply that of operationalizing the elementary principle that it is in everyone's interest that there be full employment of all resources.

As all these changes in organization were taking place, the claim was made -- and reiterated by those who work with the traditional rural model -- that the growth of urban structures had led to a decline in independence, individuality, and individual identity. It has been and still is assumed by some that several pieces of national legislation, developed to meet the conditions concomitant with the rise of industrialization, tend to submerge the individual within the mass. For example, social security did appreciably alter the structure in terms of man's responsibility for his fellow man. To most of those viewing social security in terms of the traditional model, the assumption was that it left man less responsible for himself and increased his dependence upon the government. This view was generated from the concept of independence born of self-

sufficiency. If, on the other hand, one views independence as born of interdependence, it is possible that social security not only maintained the individual's independence but his integrity and responsibility as well. Social security set up a structural variation in the urban sector, since in large part rural legislators exempted the majority of rural occupations from social security requirements. Yet social security was, basically, a system to assure the individual a program of forced savings toward retirement. But at the same time, it enforced his responsibility towards his fellow man beyond the limits of the traditional family responsibility which characterizes the traditional rural model. The individual's integrity was maintained in part by the fact that he was no longer dependent upon the will and the whim of family members or the vagaries of economic rewards that one's sons and daughters might bequeath. Similar arguments apply to collective bargaining regulations, minimum wage laws, child labor laws, and other acts of social legislation. Far from altering traditional values, they implemented them through institutionalizing them.

In yet another respect the traditional rural model does not lend itself to a revision consistent with changing conditions. Individual savings, whether through investment or earnings and/or labor, are considered essential to the growth of the individual firm and therefore to the growth of the rural economy. The traditional notion is that of putting away funds until such time as adequate cash is built up to make whatever purchase is necessary. In this fashion, the individual is not dependent upon others for capital inflow for either production or consumption purposes. Loan policies in the private sector of rural areas were harsh, with short period loans and high rates of interest for producer goods. It was felt to be questionable whether or not loans should even be made for consumer goods. This very structure brought forth the increased role of the central government in the form of the Federal Land Bank, the Production Credit Associations, the REA, and other cooperatives and government sponsored lending agencies such as the FHA. In the urban sector, the interdependence of individuals in the productive process was expanded to include individuals in the entire process of social participation which surely included consumption. It was early recognized that mass production required the social machinery and the social-structural innovations associated with mass consumption. As such, credit policies became relatively liberal; and installment buying represented a social innovation to bring the interdependence of consumption and production into some type of balance.

Viewed in terms of the traditional rural model, the new ventures in credit in the urban areas were considered to be destructive of the values of thrift, just as unemployment compensation had been viewed as destructive of the values of industry. Yet, the purpose of savings within

the system was not only maintained with the modified social structure but was increased considerably. Under the new system, they are forced savings. An individual who purchases on the installment plan is an individual who is forced to save. He buys now and pays later, but he is forced to save in a very systematic fashion and is faced with severe penalties if he does not meet the requirements of the forced savings system. In this sense, saving has by no means disappeared in our society but has become an integral part of a system which tends to assume that savings will be forthcoming.

A further assumption of the traditional model was the relative role of institutions within the social structure. The organization of the small independent enterprise of main street businesses and farming developed intimate ties between the family and economic institutions. Education was considered important, but primarily as a method of socialization to a role competency within the framework of the existing model; and religion served to reinforce the correctness and the virtues and the semi-divine nature of the rural social organization.

On the other hand, government was viewed as a necessary but passing device. "That government which governs least governs best," epitomized the laissez-faire inherent in the traditional model. Since most of the modifications in the structure of the urban sector required government to take a positive active role rather than a passive one, this approach was considered a major departure from the traditional model. Yet, even though the traditional rural model called for a passive form of governmental organization, it was not beyond the rural sector to call forth purposive activities on the part of the government. These were seen as consistent with the model in that the ICC, the Anti-Trust Act, and similar legislative structures were deemed necessary to maintain a relative balance of power in the face of concentration of property. The functioning of government was viewed as purposive and active only insofar as it was necessary to maintain the conditions which made the model viable.

Yet, the active role of government is in fact a result of a combination of diversification and specialization leading to interdependence, and the basic philosophy of democratic organization, in which the government represents the public interest rather than the specialized interests of interdependent groups. One of the requirements for decision-making on the part of the government is a vast array of information and information-gathering devices. This places government in the position of having more comprehensive knowledge of more situations and thus considerably more power to control than was the case under the traditional model. As more and more sophistication in data gathering and data analysis are developed within the government, the greater becomes the possibility for the

development of instantaneous and reliable indicators. As important as this has become to control of economic fluctuations, it is even more significant for the control of variation in the non-economic sectors of society. The increased capability of the government to be an active agent of control is inconsistent with the rural model which tends to reject governmental control except insofar as it is used in a non-directive regulatory sense to mitigate the abuses of concentrated power. The rural model does not allow for viable alternatives regarding how control should be exercised when relative equality of power among specialized interest groups in the system is not directly related to a distribution of property and capital resources.

As we said earlier, perhaps the Full Employment Act of 1946 represents the most overt statement of the positive role of government and the responsibility of the group towards the individual. Within the rural frame of reference this act was considered as absolving the individual of all responsibility for his own welfare and as having a negative effect upon initiative. In the urban structure, however, it was seen as a further indication that the individual must be afforded fruitful opportunities to participate as an individual through the development of policies and structures which would bring forth the conditions necessary to provide such opportunities. As such, the Act tended to stress the prerogatives of the individual as a participant in the system. In a like fashion, because it includes a requirement that an individual need not take a job that is below his capacity in skill even though such jobs are available, the rural model tends to think of the unemployment compensation structure, as an incentive to non-work on the part of the individual. The legislation, perhaps, was structured in such fashion so that it would increase the individual's prerogatives as an individual and make him less subject to coercive controls in order to qualify for minimum rewards from the system.

Taken individually, all of these alterations in the structure may be regarded as deviations from the traditional model. On the other hand, if taken as a group, they constitute a differentiation of the social structure without basically altering the value elements associated with the democratic ideals of individuality, independence, and integrity. The social organization of industrial democracy may well attain the same ends governed by the same values with a structure quite different from that required in an agrarian system characteristic of the midwestern United States.

Predictors of Increasing Interdependence

Agriculture has been, and will increasingly become, a part of the interdependent system which includes the whole society. Perhaps the area in which agriculture lags most is in the socio-psychological integration and the understanding of many of the new forms of social organization that have been developed to meet the conditions which arise with interdependence resulting from specialization and diversification. There is a notion among many rural people that a uniqueness is possible within the traditional rural model that is not possible within alternative forms of social organization. However, there is adequate evidence within the urban structure to indicate that while there are gigantic corporations with profits of over two billion dollars that employ literally thousands of employees, there are also small enterprises with employment of very few individuals. "Ma and Pa" groceries are found next door to supermarkets. The "Ma and Pa" grocery does not compete with the supermarket but provides a specialized service and function, and as such it co-exists. The nonmetropolitan areas of the United States apparently have been seventy and eighty million people who live in thousands of communities, ranging from the hamlet of 250 and under, to those of slightly less than 100, 000.

The survival of small units and their apparent continued persistence raise the question of whether the large-scale corporate form of industry which does its own planning is the only form industrial organization can take. Moore, Kerr, Myers, Harbison, [5] and others have taken the position that there is only one major road to industrialism in the Western world. They maintain that whenever industrialism makes its appearance, the large-scale firm does also. On the other hand, there are those such as Tumin, Smelser, Singer, Herskovits, and Blumer[6] who have maintained that there may be many roads to indus-

---

[5]See, for example, C. Kerr, J. T. Dunlop, F. H. Harbison, and C. A. Myers, Industrialism and Industrial Man (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960); and W. E. Moore and A. S. Feldman (eds.), Labor Commitment and Social Change in Developing Areas (New York: Social Science Research Council, 1960).

[6]See W. E. Moore and A. S. Feldman (eds.), op. cit., esp. articles by Belshaw, Singer, and Hoselitz. See also Edward Gross, Industry and Social Life (Dubuque: William C. Brown, 1965), ch. 3.

trialism. The outstanding case cited is that of modern Japan which succeeded in industrializing, while preserving the extended family and many of the elements of the traditional culture, although there are signs that it may be changing at the present time. These theorists call attention to the fact that there are new forms of power which never existed at the time of the first industrial revolution. In addition, in all the newer countries the government assumes an active role in speeding up the process of industrialization. Through importation of capital, equipment and expertise, it may even be possible at least to begin the process of industrialization without greatly increasing the level of education or changing the family form in any fundamental way. In the process of industrialization, therefore, some of the new countries may preserve some of their traditional organizational forms by limiting the corporate form to certain kinds of industry that absolutely require it, such as oil drilling and refining, power generation, and some other industries. Much of the manufacture of goods may take place in smaller units which may in turn take a variety of forms.

So, too, one can speculate that there may be such parallel forms peculiarly adapted to the needs of agriculture. The large family business was important in an early era. Before the invention of the corporation it was the only way of bringing together large sums of money for investment. The family firm persists and is well adapted to the spreading of risks in small firms as well as in firms which must maintain irregular hours. There is evidence that the traditional bureaucratic devaluation of nepotism has been overdrawn. Members of the same family help insure succession, loyalty, and unified action and organization. It is not necessarily even inconsistent with the large-scale corporate form. Such an argument may possibly apply to agriculture as well. It may be that while the large commercialized farm dominates certain kinds of agriculture because it is more efficient than the other, the small family farm so dear to the hearts of the apologists for the rural tradition in the United States may persist, because it is more efficient for certain kinds of agriculture.

Summary and Projections

In sum, the large farmer has become part of the giant interdependence system with the large society. He seeks guarantees for prices and controls on the prices of things that he buys in exactly the same way as do the corporate managers of the urban firms with whom he does business. In this process, the ones who suffer are the ones who remain outside the interdependence system; and in the rural area this will consist mainly of service workers, the small merchants, and the small farmers. They are outside not only in space but also in process,

insofar as they are unable to adopt the tactics of either the large farmer or the corporate manager; thus, they are unable to control supplies or prices. When a large corporation is met with the demands for higher wages from its workers, it may well grant them, since the cost of higher wages can be passed on to the consumer in the form of higher prices. On the other hand, when the owner of a small business is confronted by a demand for an increase in wages, he can only pay this out of his own earnings and is unable to pass it on.

The city and metropolitan areas persist and grow because of the economic, social, and cultural advantages of concentration. The urban organizational form has developed in Western society as the major means whereby the major institutions which Westerners value can be supported. Although some see the city as the place in which major social problems are concentrated, these problems are a reflection of the great growth of cities and of the fact that most of the population lives in them. It is hardly surprising that "people" problems will be most concentrated where most people live.

The concept of a pluralistic society has usually been applied only to the value system. It may be, however, that the United States is becoming a society with a single value system, in which persons are in general agreement on the desirability of a high standard of living, a low mortality rate, education, and science and technology as avenues to the solution of major problems.

Yet that single-value system may be associated with a dual-economic system: One is the system we have described as associated with the supercorporate form of industrial organization and the large, commercialized farm; the other is the small firm and the small farm, both usually owned or managed by the family.

Small units may simply co-exist because they perform functions that the supercorporations and commercialized farms simply cannot perform. Some of these functions are related to the nature of the enterprise wherein family control is necessary for economic viability. Similarly, small rural towns, while declining as trade centers, are becoming centers for outdoor recreation -- even to the extent of calling mosquito swamps "sky-blue waters" or by making the Thoreau-based claim of the virtue and satisfying pleasure of isolation in the wilderness from urban ugliness. Some of these towns remain centers of government as county seats, administering state and federal grants and contributions, while others find they are near enough to large industry or cities to advertise themselves as commuter suburbs. Still others find it worthwhile to advertise in Northern and Eastern cities that they will

grant special help and tax write-offs to new industry, not to mention the local labor force which "has not forgotten that you have to give an honest day's work for an honest dollar." If such appeals succeed, the interdependence system we have described will continue to include rural towns. But to assume that all rural communities can become as functionally necessary to an interdependent society as they were to systems based on subsistence agriculture is hardly warranted. Those communities which survive will resemble the community of the classical model only to the extent that they celebrate the reconstructed historical past.

3. THE SCHOOL AND THE CHURCH IN CHANGING AMERICA

William L. Cofell

The small rural community is by no means a phenomenon of the past. That it has proved far more viable than experts had predicted is due in great part to two traditional institutions: the school and the church. These institutions, however, have recently felt the impact of change -- social, economic, and technical change. The business of this paper will be a re-examination of these institutions in the light of present trends in the rural communities they serve.

A community can be defined as a group of people organized and interacting through institutions -- such as schools, churches, government, business -- to achieve common and mutual purposes. In this paper the word "community" is applied to rural areas with populations ranging from 800 to 1500 persons residing within natural, parish, or political boundaries. Although in some texts it is defined as a neighborhood, this is the small community; and in our experience in the Midwest, this is the way in which residents of such areas define the term.

Toward the end of this discussion we shall examine the concept of the enlarged community and shall suggest in light of the facts presented in this paper that larger community must be developed if rural areas are to adjust to and survive the changes now underway. It is this writer's opinion that a sizeable rural population needs to be retained in order to ease the pressing problems of metropolitan areas. The migration of rural youth to the cities points up the need for coming to grips with the fundamental causes of the movement. The most obvious of these would appear to be the lack of occupational opportunity and the psychology peculiar to American country life. Both have their roots in the rural school and church.

Rural Education in Transition

We direct our attention to the problem of education and the rural community at a time when the educational institutions in the small, open country community are practically non-existent. In this State (Minnesota), for example, they will cease to exist in the public sector by 1970; and according to present indicators the smaller rural parochial

schools will rapidly follow suit.

The strength of feeling and belief regarding the value of the small rural school, whether it be a one-room or multi-room school, is revealed in community reaction to efforts to close such schools. There has been considerable hostile reaction toward laws which in effect have given official sanction to establishing orderly procedures for reorganizing school districts as small rural neighborhood schools have closed. It is ironic that in rural society a great deal of energy and no little time and money have been spent attacking laws directed toward school reorganization. The enactment of these reorganization laws has been regarded as an attack upon the traditional pattern of rural school organization and, more importantly, upon rural life itself.

EFFECTS OF CURRENT SCHOOL LEGISLATION. The reorganization law requiring every school district in Minnesota to provide a complete school curriculum from kindergarten through grade twelve does not go into effect until 1970. To date, not a single one-room school has closed as a result of enforcement, but some have closed because of anticipated enforcement of the law. In many cases, however, other pressures have precipitated the decision at an earlier date.

The fact is that many of these schools have gone out of existence. Yet the legislative enactment has provided a focus or deflected attention of social forces operative in rural communities. Hardly any action has caused more agony and furor in the rural community than laws requiring some orderly arrangement to provide for the education of rural children in rural areas.

Why does the rural population become so upset, anxious, and angry over changes in rural school organization? A very important reason is the recognition that adjustments must be made in the power structure of a community and the subsequent control of institutions. Another reason is the failure to recognize the social and economic forces operating in and upon their community. Generally, cultural changes in the past were slow; more recently, however, many important cultural changes have come about so rapidly that it is difficult -- not to say impossible -- for people to recognize their far-reaching impact upon the lives of all concerned.

BACKGROUND OF CHANGE IN RURAL EDUCATIONAL STRUCTURE. The rural community has been slow to recognize and acknowledge the nature of social organization. As a result the tendency has been to overlook the fact that a change in any sector of community life tends to create an imbalance that affects other aspects of the social structure.

Let us examine some of the factors responsible for changes in the educational structure of the rural community. Such an examination may prove helpful in understanding changes in rural society and in the prediction of significant changes in the future.

One all-encompassing trend is the rural-to-urban migration. This movement, continuous since the 1930's, indicates that not many young people have been encouraged to remain in or return to rural areas. As the decade of the 1930's drew to a close, most colleges had discontinued the training of teachers for the six and eight grade, one-room rural schools, shifting emphasis to young women preparing for single-grade teaching jobs in urban areas. The changes in teacher education programs coincided with rapid growth of urban and suburban centers, where the increased number of children created an urgent demand for teachers. This demand, following World War II, became more highly competitive and rural areas could not meet the competition.

The rural teacher of the 1950's and 1960's in those one-room schools still operating were mostly older women in their late fifties or early sixties. They were by and large, graduates of the teacher training programs of the 1920's and 1930's who had taught in a rural school, married a farmer or local businessman, raised their families, and, upon insistence from the desparate local school board, had re-entered a teaching career in middle age. These schools have had to close as teachers retired with no available replacements. Thus, the supply of eligible teachers for the rural and small town schools has rapidly declined. The small rural high school is confronted with the same kind of conditions as those responsible for closing the one-room schools; they will consequently be forced to accept a consolidated administration in order to secure qualified teachers.

Laws in some states, particularly the requirement of the four-year degree, made the inexperienced teacher with a degree more acceptable to the large urban and suburban school system. This increased competition began after 1958 in Minnesota and earlier in other states. For a number of years the urban schools have gone directly to the colleges for recruits rather than hiring teachers who first acquired their experience in rural schools.

This development has had another interesting effect in changing the character of the rural school. Before the degree requirement went into force, the rural school had been the training ground for practically all teachers. Some went on to the town or city schools but some married rural or small town men and remained to form the cadre of teachers, while the younger ones moved into the cities. It should not surprise us

then that generally teachers in the metropolitan areas are younger than their rural counterparts. Furthermore, because of this dwindling rural teaching staff and the decreasing number of children in rural communities the implications for the present social structure are clear.

The fact appears to be that most rural schools have closed, not because of legislative enactments but rather because of two major social conditions: teacher shortage and the reduced number of students needed for maintenance of adequate educational facilities. These factors are operative in the parochial school as well as the public even though the problem has only recently been recognized in the former.

SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF THE RURAL PARISH SCHOOL. The parish school of ten or twenty years ago was criticized because the teaching sisters were not qualified for certification. The heroic efforts of the 1950's and early 1960's to upgrade the sisters professionally have made today's teaching sister as well qualified as her lay counterpart. There are, however, fewer teaching sisters and so the financial problems are accentuated by the need to hire more and more lay teachers. Often the lay teachers accessible to the more remote parish schools do not meet certification requirements, many being older women who fall into the same catagory as the teachers who kept small rural public schools going. The increasing shortage of sisters caused by resignations from the Orders and the lack of vocations to fill vacancies created by death, illness, and retirement have increased employment of lay teachers at minimum salaries and sometimes with minimum qualifications. The reduced number of sisters, then, and the nonavailability of lay teachers at low salaries account for the end of the small rural parochial school.

The Dilemma of a Technological Revolution

NEED FOR RATIONAL PLANNING. It is in a sense tragic, but perhaps inevitable, that whereas much effort has been expended in the attempt to save the school little has been devoted to rational planning on the part of the community which might have sustained a better educational program. It may be too late for many rural communities to make decisions regarding their future. They may have drifted too long and thus have forfeited their opportunity. Some would say the decline and eventual death of the small community is a good thing. On the other hand, if we believe that the countryside offers distinct advantages for human living, we must recognize that a good deal of time and effort has been spent in the wrong direction.

The underlying factor which created the attractive opportunities in urban centers and which encouraged the outmigration pressure in rural areas is the quiet technological revolution in our society. The farm people have adopted technology but have not been aware of the social changes initiated by it. They have received considerable assistance from sources beyond and outside the local community. Few people really comprehend the extent and rapidity of technological change that has occurred on American farms in almost every agricultural area of the country. The farmers who have survived are those who have changed and enlarged their operations. The introduction of powered machinery alone, for example, has radically altered the total human labor requirements.

What factors have encouraged the rapid introduction of labor and time-saving machinery? To begin with, such realities as draft laws with a seeming preference for rural youth have forced many middle-aged farmers to purchase machinery to supply for labor loss. Fertilizers for restoring or maintaining soil fertility quite simply demanded new tillage and farming techniques. The introduction of hybrid and new crop strains created a whole new production viewpoint in agriculture. Laws or regulations requiring standards for the production of grade A milk introduced a new phase of agricultural change. With electricity came inherent changes in working and living standards. These and other factors have had their effect in accelerating or assisting American agriculture forward in the total trend of the technological revolution.

SCOPE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF CHANGE. Rural people have failed to grasp the fact that they cannot insulate themselves from the social change flowing from technological growth. They have been quicker to rationalize the adoption of technology than to plan rationally for the social reorganization it entails. A large segment of our rural society still operates in an ideational system of myth, mystique, and illusion about rural life that is no longer tenable. In fact, we are largely unaware that the open country farm system which resulted primarily from the passage of the homestead laws was actually an experiment in agricultural systems, one that may ultimately prove a failure.

Our myths about the nature of rural life and society may prevent us from assisting our communities toward suitable development. The myth about the farmers' independence may be the ideological mystique that could prevent the cooperative planning necessary to solve rural problems. The fact is that farmers today can make few decisions without an awareness of the complexity of interacting agencies. For example, decisions about new plants and strains, the nature of present and future markets, government regulations on conservation and income tax all

force the farmer into an interdependent social reality.

Why should the rural segment be the only exception in a social system where rational and corporate decision-making characterize all other segments? People in rural areas can no longer operate effectively as independent, self-sustaining family units. Their rationale and system of belief prevent them from engaging in the very action that could insure survival of a living rural community. People must be brought to understand that the acceptance of power machinery and other technological innovations introduces conditions requiring new social and economic organization and adjustment.

The introduction of new techniques requires changes in capitalization, land utilization, enlarged acreages, different labor utilization, and new farm business practices. These new methods increase the rate of change as farmers discover, for example, that capital investment used creatively and imaginatively accelerates and strengthens the farming operation. The farmer who buys additional land to bring his operation into economic balance creates the situation leading to a population shift. This in turn means fewer families and fewer children in the rural areas. The population shift may in effect mean changes in the financial support of rural schools, parishes, and other institutions. The average age of farm operators rises as families pass beyond the child-bearing age or as young people leave the rural areas. These are trends likely to be accelerated in more remote rural communities.

Two important factors appear in the population decline in rural areas. One is that the average age of the farmer is about 47 or 48 years, suggesting that many families have passed their child-bearing age. The other has to do with the use of birth control. Both priests and doctors report evidence that women in rural communities are using the pill and other contraceptive techniques. The statements are supported also by a survey conducted last summer in the St. Cloud Diocese (Minnesota), in which it was found that in 1962 the number of baptisms in two urban parishes was 240; in 1967 -- only five years later -- it had dropped to 140, a decrease of 42 per cent. In sixteen rural parishes, the survey showed the number of baptisms was 479 in 1962 and by 1967 it had fallen to 347, a decrease of 28 per cent. Even more significant is the fact that 42 per cent of this decrease occurred in one year -- 1966 to 1967.

Rural population trends indicate then that many young families are moving out; some are using birth control techniques. These factors discourage undue optimism for the future of the rural school, parish, and community. This all means that a population base is not going to be present for the maintenance of a viable community. Most of the youth

born in the last eighteen years will not remain in their rural community. We can, in fact, predict the acceleration of this out-migration from the rural communities -- a migration not only of individual youths but of families as well when these are unable to maintain themselves economically in rural areas.

If youth in particular leave, they must have the kind of education that fits them vocationally and socially for urban living. The older men with families are often in dire need of vocational education and counseling services that can restore their self-respect and self-confidence, necessary attitudes for successful and productive life in an urban environment. At present people moving from farm to city seldom avail themselves of these opportunities because of the misguided notion that education is intended only for the very young. Even those who remain on the land need education that will more adequately prepare them for rural living. This means not only preparation to cope with the vocational and technological aspects of agriculture but also the economic and social education that will enable them to maintain themselves and their communities.

The cost of capitalization -- in land, machinery, and livestock -- presents challenges the rural community must meet. In my opinion, the change in farm business capitalization costs makes the continuation of the traditional pattern of family tenure and property transfer even more precarious. Thus the young person in the rural area is practically compelled to seek opportunities elsewhere. He may find many reasons why he wants out of the rural community with its restricted environment. The very fact, for instance, that city investors have used farms as a means of tax loss on other income has inflated farm values beyond the range of rural farm boys.

The Dilemma and Human Reaction

These are social factors that are at work enforcing changes in the rural community. Young people do not, or perhaps cannot, remain in the community. Professionally educated people, the potential leaders, do not return to the rural community. As a result, the rural community loses effective leadership trained to analyze, interpret, and cope with the forces operating in the modern rural society.

The need for analysis is imperative for any community that hopes to sustain itself. Effective community action programs are those conducted by the people themselves. Outsiders may provide some technical expertise, but the extent of their involvement depends upon what the people themselves are ready and willing to do. Analysis based on factual data

is the most certain deterrent to operating under a mythical concept of rural life. The rural community and farm society have native leaders, but their tendency is often to focus upon single-aspect problems. In general leaders as well as communities have failed to see the rural community as an interrelated whole that participates in the total context of the general economic, social, and technical life. In the past they have had to lead a people possessed of a mystique in conflict with social reality

The leaders, as well as the people, have reacted and responded with psychological and sociological naivete when confronted with a threat to their way of life. In this social atmosphere there has not been a rational assessment of the forces in motion. It is unfortunate that the unification of the community has been emotionally solidified around institutions destined for extinction so that in effect the expenditure of energies has been directed toward saving a symbol of the community or neighborhood unity. In many instances the school has been seen as such a symbol; it has provided satisfaction and a valued service. Its passing signifies decay and threat to the community structure, for with it disappears the feeling of self-direction and local control.

Other factors, in addition to the loss of the school, compound the feeling of threat and increase the psychological signification of loss. Almost all rural open country communities have empty, abandoned, and decaying farmsteads. It may be noted that other farmsteads are deteriorating, occupied by non-farming rural residents often in precarious economic straits. The village part of the community loses its creamery, machinery dealer, petroleum bulk plant, and service stations. The consolidation of farm machinery dealerships has continued rapidly since the late 1940's. There is an interesting fact reported by Father Martin Schirber in an OED report on Sherburne County, Minnesota. He notes that there is not a single farm machinery dealership in the County.

All these factors are evidence to the rural residents of loss and deterioration. They react to the loss with feelings of inferiority and all too often stake everything on maintaining the status quo. They grasp at the symbol even after the reality has passed. This activity distracts them from a recognition of the forces of technological and social change that must be dealt with.

This failure to recognize the impact of social change accounts to some extent for the feelings of persecution and the suspicion that someone or some force outside the community is responsible for the breakdown of social unity and rural values. There may be such forces, but the rural community, because of its insular viewpoints, has been unable to develop the resources needed to cope with the extra-community

realities.

It is interesting to note that reaction to change is often directed toward some person. It is this insecurity that frequently results in a conviction of a deliberate social, economic, or political plot organized for the destruction of rural life and values. This condition accounts to some extent for the large following George Wallace was able to command in some rural communities. He became a spokesman for the local control they saw slipping away. He also provided a rallying point for venting their frustration and rage against the system. Like city rioters they found a focal point for the expression of pent-up ethnic, parochial, and local hostilities.

It was little understood and perhaps made little difference that George Wallace and local control had the purpose of excluding Black pupils from Southern schools and, in general, of opposing the desegregation movement. George Wallace was hardly offering a palliative for deteriorating small communities in the Midwest.

TO SUMMARIZE. Much of what has been said suggests that we find a reaction of negativism, resistance to change, and the creation of organizations devoted to forstalling social realities.

A Possible Resolution: The Larger Community

SURVIVAL DEMANDS ORGANIZATION. What is the future of the small rural community? I agree with the general thesis of Dr. George Donohue that rural communities will not disappear; but I make one major reservation, namely, if rural communities continue to drift as at present, the result will be the continuation of the present erosion -- demographic, social, and economic.

The alternative to the drift is organization -- adoption and execution of a rational and planned program of community development. This requires leadership with imagination, vision, competency, and skill. The leaders must be people who have values and know how effectively to implement them in action. Leadership that focuses on the mystiques of rural life and approaches the problem only within the narrow limits of the agricultural component is jousting with few existing windmills.

REVISION OF THE CONCEPT OF COMMUNITY. One imperative goal is a program of education directed toward revising and enlarging the concept of community, one that corresponds to the reality of social interaction in an area. What are some of the necessary considerations

in determining a viable community? One factor is a population base large enough to assure strength in social and economic life. I would consider ten to fifteen thousand minimal. In general, however, if all factors necessary for effective and economic community services are considered, I believe twenty-five thousand would be a more realistic minimum figure.

The community must be large enough to attract enough industry to provide off-farm employment for young people. The rural industry must operate in such a way as to provide real opportunity for young people. The concept of establishing industry in rural areas to take advantage of "cheap labor" will not prevent continuing decline of the rural community. It will merely delay the final demise.

The community must have a population base large enough to supply these services required by people everywhere. These include medical, dental, and hospital care, provision for adequate education, social, and recreational services. Generally, I believe that kind of community that will survive will have to be defined by school district boundaries which closely approximate general trade and service areas. This means that the geographical area may encompass one or more counties in the states of the upper Midwest.

Villages of less than 1000 persons will continue to decline or disappear, or again they may remain static and become places of retirement for persons in their later years. As the impact of urban culture increasingly reaches into the rural regions, the rural village will become less and less desirable in competition with suburban retirement facilities and sun communities in the Southwest. One might safely say that the farther the small village is from the large urban center, the less chances it has for survival.

The small community must begin to conceive of itself as a residential neighborhood working for common ends with other similar neighborhoods in the same general area. This means that present intercommunity rivalries must be put aside and that town-country hostility must also subside. It means that the whole territorial region must work together to exploit the assets and enhance the living possibilities for the common good of the area. Communities must be educated to think more in terms of an organic unity in a larger context of more complex social interaction through expanded social, economic, governmental, religious, and service institutions.

The people of the villages must become as much concerned about conditions in the countryside as they are about affairs of the village.

The people of the countryside must learn to share concern for the villages and cities. It is only through cooperation and common action that each segment can establish conditions for survival and development.

It is unrealistic for small communities to collect and expend funds in the belief that they can establish conditions attractive to industry. They would be better advised to devote time, energy, money, and attention to the study of intercommunity cooperation and the means to achieve it. The inclusion of the open country farmer and cooperation with other adjacent village communities within the enlarged community concept would seem a more rational plan and would carry the germ of potential development.

The reorganization of the farming enterprise will continue to force the trend away from the traditional open-country farm. Farmers with technological knowledge and economic foresight will continue to enlarge their operation and capital investment. The problem of farm operator-owners will be to reorganize their operation in such a way that sons and sons-in-law can join them in the farming enterprise. The present system of land transfer encourages breakup at the death or retirement of the father since some sons choose to leave the farm. At the same time, young men find it difficult, if not impossible, to finance the beginning farm operation without parental assistance. Thus, the parent who may wish to assist all his children finds problems of equitable inheritance difficult to solve. To complicate matters, most rural banking practices do not permit the extension of the kind of loans necessary if young men are to capitalize in the land, livestock, and machinery needed in modern farming. It seems that all of this leads to fewer farms and thus fewer services required in an area; and it all points toward further decline of the population needed for community life.

It has often been said that man has been able to arrive at many inventions in science and technology but has been unable to solve the social problems resulting from them. It may be that man is unable to deal rationally with the social factors. If so, we shall probably continue to drift, but if we can design model cities and salvage old ones, we should be able to do some adequate planning among and with rural people for rural areas. In fact, this plan might prove more economical than model cities as one alleviation of population pressures.

People, organizations, and institutions must adopt difficult procedures if drift is to cease. Every group -- whether cooperative, farm organization, chamber of commerce, or the church -- ought to consider most carefully what it really values in rural living. Then it must engage in planning that provides and supports the kind of leadership that will produce strong community life.

The Church's Role

Since we are concerned with the role the church ought to play in a community, we must first examine its role in present communities as we see them. The social role of the churches in the rural community has been toward preservation of the status quo. The religious representative has too often seen his task as one of opposing change. Instead of acting as analyzer, interpreter, reconciler, catalyst, or prophet, the church in altogether too many cases has functioned as though the preservation of the present institutions were its paramount concern and mission. In our area at least, the representatives of the church have been associated with the group interested in the maintenance of the small rural schools, both public and parochial.

It may be that in the training of pastors the emphasis has centered too strongly on the liturgical and sacramental functions to the neglect of leadership roles. Little attention was given to the fact that the pastor must be a leader in the larger community as well as in the parish. In this capacity he must be able to develop living contacts and relationships with people, in order that they in turn might renew and reunify the community and themselves.

The pastor who believes that the Eucharist is the signification of community must realize that a community has to exist before it can be symbolized. Further, it must be recognized that as part of his pastoral role he serves as a social agent seeking to create viable community relationships. We might recall that Christ worked three years at building community, and that it was only at the end of his ministry that he symbolized it in a sacramental fashion. It may be that the tasks of formation needed today are precisely those that have been neglected in the past.

If the pastor is to assist in the development of community, he must learn to react to the needs of the whole community. He is the person who ought to have an encompassing view of social organization. The pastor should see the community as a whole and serve it as a whole.

Pastors must achieve a larger perspective on their vocation as mediators of improved relations among all people. And they must assist their people in overcoming the prejudices, antagonisms and rivalries existing within parishes and communities.

The pastor in the rural community specifically must take care in forming assumptions about his people. He must make sure that he does not underestimate the intelligence of the people with whom he communicates.

There are very few people in our parishes who cannot respond to genuine concern. Too often it is assumed that rural people are intellectually dull and lacking in understanding and knowledge. Rural people in a relatively homogeneous community may react this way because it is expected of them. They have learned not to expect too much of themselves when in the presence of better educated persons. But the farmer is not the stereotyped dull-witted peasant of the past.

The Future

What then does the future hold? What is the future of the community, the parish, and the school?

The parish can serve real human needs. But the pastor and the people must see the need of enhancing their lives by seeking avenues for expanding human relationships. The perspectives of social and personal vision must be enlarged to encompass the reality created by technical and social change. Much needs to be done to enhance respect for the human person in its individual and social aspects. Human beings need continuous assistance in understanding the complexity of modern social existence. If we are rational in the creation of technological complexes, then we need to be rational in the creation of services that assist people in dealing with complex emotional and personal aspects of existence. There appears to be considerable need to expand parochial viewpoints that in themselves contribute to disturbing social attitudes and behavior.

The education of children must reflect social reality. To have the type of school organization that places limitations or restrictions on the experience of children -- whether it is a small, rural elementary school or a large, segregated urban school -- is simply to maintain discriminatory, unrealistic, and essentially un-Christian situations.

In the long run, the changes in rural areas will continue. These changes will not occur as the result of analysis, foresight, and planning; they will occur as a result of the impact of forces beyond the community. The changes will continue as people within the community fail to make significant decisions. Perhaps the reality of the situation will be recognized only when no choices are left.

We have the reality of teachers not being interested in returning to rural areas. We have the loss of priestly and religious vocations. We have the technological revolution. We have evidence of a tendency to drift and to delay decision, to adopt postures of negative action and maintenance of the status quo.

Do we have to accept a dismal prognosis for the future of the rural

community? If we continue to drift, the outlook is dim. To drift is to leave the community exposed to the inevitability of enforced change, a process that often results in emotional antagonism, a sense of futility, and community disruption. The alternative is to educate people, including children, to a new sense of community. The isolated community of the past cannot maintain itself; realistic community in today's world implies interdependence beyond the family and neighborhood. Intelligent direction and planning can bring progress about.

I conclude by calling attention to our need for faith. We need faith to believe that human beings can act responsibly in the face of the realities they meet and the times in which they live. We need to test our faith in human beings by interacting in a community. We need to believe that in the interaction human beings can derive satisfactory communal relationship which extend to and protect the individual human person and his identity and assist him in recognizing that this cannot be achieved without a healthy community.

Most of all we need faith to believe that the Holy Spirit is guiding the human community towards goals that our limited human vision cannot perceive. We need faith to see that new cultural forms and social structures are not to be resisted and retarded, but positively entered into with a deep sense of purpose and direction; for if these trends are in the hands of God, they will grow and flourish. And in this process we can believe.

4. RURAL-URBAN BALANCE —LOOKING AHEAD TO 1980

Edward L. Henry

I want to discuss a slightly different aspect of this whole problem of the effects that changing technology is producing in our countryside. More specifically, I am going to talk about the future role of some natural growth centers namely, those outstate communities between 10, 000 and 50, 000 in size to which we have affixed the name "micro cities."

Perhaps I am somewhat arbitrarily designating cities of this size as "micro cities." Surprisingly, though, almost 75 million Americans today still live outside the major urban complexes. Ten million or fewer of these live on farms and the others in cities with populations ranging from a few hundred to 50, 000. We could roughly divide our population in the United States today into thirds with about a third in the large metropolitan core cities, a third in the suburbs or areas surrounding core cities, and a third outside the metropolitan areas on farms and in cities of under 50, 000. The great bulk of all U. S. cities (18, 000 of them) are in the micro and mini size category (16, 800). It is the larger cities in these two size groups that seem capable of becoming growth centers in the federal system: the micro city.

Reversing the Population Drift

My thesis holds that the national interest requires a reversal of the population drift to the large city. Whether this can be or should be fostered by positive public policy is now becoming a great national issue. There are certain developments, I think, which suggest an affirmative answer to this question. These involve the growing problems of the big city, including civil disorders and the increasing diseconomies of scale for living and working there. The answer to repopulating the countryside to a large degree revolves around the production of viable centers of job creation, shopping variety, educational and cultural amenities, governmental service institutions, and medical and entertainment facilities. Centers possessing these conveniences become "mother cities," a modern parallel to the major city of the ancient Greek city state with a clientele extending forty to sixty miles into the hinterland. While some smaller hamlets may not survive, others can transform their historical farm service functions into residential or recreational ones.

For "mother cities" to materialize into truly viable communities attractive to job creating industry, both a private and a public infrastructure -- a supporting complex of services -- must be present. Just as there is probably a size below which diseconomies of scale begin to set in, so is there a minimum size below which insufficient scale prevents economies.

A proper growth strategy for Minnesota involves the encouragement of these "mother city" growth centers as the best way to provide increased options for living the "good life" for those of our citizens who want options. Today the future of both the smaller mini-cities and the micro-cities are tied to the future of job creation, largely but not entirely in the micro-city. Spillover benefits to the smaller places and the countryside will result.

The micro-city today in Minnesota and in many states of the Midwest seems to possess excellent potential not only for achieving economic and residential growth but also for gaining most of the dimensions of the "good life." I would define the "good life" as one which provides prospects for human development -- material, intellectual, cultural, and social. The growth prospects of such size communities spring both from their potential for positive contributions to human living and from the diseconomies of scale and the civil disorders which are increasingly plaguing the metropolis.

Making Possible the Good Life

"People came together in the city to survive," says Aristotle, "but they stayed on to live the good life." The proper function of the city historically has been to humanize man. In this respect the city has a moral function as the Greeks illustrated so well in theory and in practice. The city, ideally, is not an ant hill nor a wasp's nest but a community. It is really designed to meet man's most urgent needs and his highest aspirations. The very word "city" comes from the Latin root civis which is also the root for "citizen" and for "civilization."

Indeed, the city is the social womb that nurtures and protects the basic institutions of society; those that humanize man -- the church, the school, the museum, the art gallery, the library, the hospital, and the institutions for job creation. But the city can also dehumanize through its impersonalism, through its ghettos, through its debilitating environment. And when it does this it has lost its basic moral claim to existence.

The question, I suppose, is at what point in size does the sense of community and the dehumanizing function begin to erode? Thomas

Jefferson put a low ceiling on it. "I view great cities," he said, "as pestilential to the morals, health, and liberties of man."[1] Even as late as 1850, however, long after Jefferson had made this laconic indictment, less than thirteen percent of the U. S. population lived in cities. And very few cities had as many as 50,000 people. But the trend was evident. Horace Greeley, a latter day Orville Freeman, wrote plaintively in the New York Tribune in 1867, "We cannot all live in cities, yet nearly all seem determined to do so. Millions of acres... solicit cultivation... yet hundreds of thousands reject this and rush into cities."[2] That "rush" reversed itself briefly only twice in the decade following Greeley's gloomy observation -- once early in the twentieth century and again during the depression of the thirties when the jobless of the cities sought with true physiocratic instincts to return to the soil.

Today the population is piling up in our major population areas. This great migration, one of the largest in history, took 800,000 off the farms in 1968 alone, and ten million in the decade of the 1950's. In Minnesota in the 1950-60 period only 15 of the 87 counties held or improved their population level. One half of all counties in the United States lost population in the 1950-60 period, and we now have more open land in this country than at the turn of the century. Continued escalation of population in the major metropoli brings us the threat of having as many as sixty million people living in a single super metropolis by the turn of the century. Population growth alone between now and the year 2000 can generate an additional 150 Clevelands.

How large can we afford to let these complexes become? Somewhere diseconomies of scale set in for the businessman, the resident, the taxpayer. We know that marginal costs of working, living, and providing public services rise with population. New York, for instance, invests $21,000 to bring each commuter into the city to work; Washington, D.C., invests $23,000 to do the same thing. Fargo, North Dakota, on the other hand, spends $487,000 on its whole program for a year -- a sum which would bring twenty-one commuters into Washington to work.[3] Robert

---

[1]As quoted in Charles Glaab and A. T. Brown, A History of Urban America (New York: Macmillan, 1967), p. 55.

[2]Ibid., p. 136.

[3]Frederick Fischer, "The People Game," National Civic Review (November, 1968), p. 510.

Wood, undersecretary of HUD, tells us that each new suburban home requires a public investment of $10,000 for facilities. This is why some legislators need education when they say that the municipal officials are wasteful and that they should give the voters a veto power on their spending programs. Legislators fail to understand that with an increase in private spending public spending has to go up or garbage will not be picked up nor sewers run out to the suburbs, criminals will loot the local stores and houses burn down.

This type of analysis, graphic though it is, ignores the tremendous and incalculable social and psychological costs of prolonged congestion; it ignores the human pangs of ghetto living; it ignores the increasingly bleak future of the inner city as the wealthy move out and leave the problems and the high cost of citizens behind; and it ignores the depressing spectre of continuing deterioration of physical environment. Rene Dubos, a Nobel prize winner in biology, has said of congested living that "hardly anything is known concerning the delayed and indirect consequences of early exposure to these conditions.... Some of the most profound effects of the environment may not be on the physical health but on behavioral patterns and mental development."[4]

Glimpsing the Evolving Growth Trends

Is it presumptuous to predict that if the anarchy characterizing some of our major cities like New York continues, people will desperately seek to escape it and that the flight to suburbia which characterized the major cities in the past 25 years will in turn become a flight to the countryside and the small cities? While we should make gigantic national efforts to salvage the conditions of living in our metropoli, let us also recognize that we are not making good use of the countryside, including micro-cities; and that as a matter of national policy and as a correlative to helping the metropolis, we should be utilizing our micro-cities increasingly for purposes of living and working. To a thoughtful man, it does not make sense that we should continue to concentrate the bulk of our population on a very small fraction of our land area. The last conscious national land settlement policy we had was the Homestead Act of 1862 and that was quite successful in settling the West. Since that time we have let nature take its course with what I contend are unhappy results.

A new land use policy -- a 1969 Homestead Act -- ought to stress the role of the micro-city as the focal center of services to a repopulated

---

[4]Ibid.

countryside. One must start in such a way as to economize on the use of resources to be spent on repopulation. It is time for a strong rebuttal to Harvey Cox's indictment of the smaller community in his Secular City. Changing technology and increasing affluence have made such communities more surely humanizing agents than they were even two decades ago. Smaller old towns can be made into growing new cities. And when juxtaposed with the largest cities, some of these smaller ones look exceedingly good as places to live and work. What advantages the largest cities still possess in the way of Guthrie Theaters or Como Parks or museums of art or symphony orchestras will in time, because of super highways, be available to most people at the price of a two hours' drive. Indeed, even some of these attractions have become increasingly mobile and are now brought to the people instead of the people to them.

The decentralized college system has seeded centers of culture throughout the state so that education that once seemed a monopoly of the large city is now available on a commuter basis to almost every resident of the state. Invention of the school consolidation device is effecting economies and qualities of scale in primary and secondary education throughout the state.

Open space, clean air, cheaper land sites, natural recreational areas within easy reach, less congestion, the potential for community participation and dialogue, and the potential structuring of a better racial mix are additional ingredients of this good living. The awakening of the micro-cities to modern public service techniques spurred on by federal urban programs is creating a new know-how among even small city officials and is opening new horizons for good public service norms. Nor should one forget the eternal human propensity to create anew, to plan for new utopias. Here, the smaller communities much more clearly than the metropoli have a controllable future ahead. We are not at all certain that the billions of dollars poured into the large cities the last ten years have really dented their basic problems.

Even economic trends may be favoring the larger utilization of the micro-cities as growth areas. A recent Department of Commerce study concluded that metropolitan areas may be caught in a people-job squeeze by 1975 (even with suburban job growth) and that outmigration to smaller cities must occur to keep the unemployment rate at four percent. [5] Optimal employment opportunities look best for cities of 50,000 to

---

[5]Jonathan Lindley, "The Economic Environment and Urban Development," U. S. Department of Commerce (April 28, 1967).

500, 000; perhaps we can, with proper public policy, edge it down to 25, 000.

A changing technology calling for single-story production lines and extensive plant and land sites rather than the multi-story buildings required by high land costs within the congested areas is increasingly attracting the attention of economists.

Planning Based on Regional Conditions

In the past, city location, i.e. plant location, was largely determined by the need for water or rail communication or power sources. These are no longer a severely limiting factors given vastly improved and new forms of transportation. An increasing part of our GNP is the output of service industries which do not spend heavily on transportation costs. It would seem, therefore, that some of the major limiting factors which historically rule out the location of industry in hinterlands are no longer so significant; and it no longer seems so certain that manufacturers must locate near the centers of consumption.

If such smaller centers have the potential for growth, then the State of Minnesota and our surrounding neighbors have heavy vested interests in shaping public policies to favor these potential growth areas. By helping these, the State will be indirectly helping smaller communities at the same time; for it will be the attractiveness of these smaller cities that induces people to settle in hamlets and villages that have access to these mother cities. Minnesota has experienced a net outmigration for some years; and if it wishes to step up the pace of its economy, this is one long-term way to do it. Yet, in a number of ways state policy has not specifically recognized this need for an outstate growth strategy. State aid policies, annexation laws, and liquor laws, for example, have not kept these city needs in mind. There have also been some commendable moves such as state school consolidation changes, improvement of outstate colleges, and a new bloc grant-in-aid program to local governments.

None of these policies, however, was consciously formulated in contemplation of growth considerations and a new community mosaic; they were formed rather to meet specific ad hoc pressures on the legislature. Problems facing our outstate cities are no longer their problems only but must be placed within a context of statewide planning. A growth strategy is needed and not simply a reaction strategy.

If diseconomies of scale occur at some upper point of population growth, is there also a minimum size below which diseconomies of operation result because of insufficient scale? Much urban research

today is centered on the fascinating question of what size community seems able to accomplish economies of scale. Is it at 2500 population as presumed in one Department of Agriculture study done in Kansas;[6] or at 50, 000 as postulated by a prestigious businessmen's research group, the Committee on Economic Development.[7] Or do economies of scale depend on what function one is talking about -- a retail shopping center or a mother city parish? A study by the University of South Dakota concluded that a trade area population of 40, 000 to 60, 000 seems to be required under current conditions to support a complete shopping center. In South Dakota such large shopping centers average about 38, 000 people in their trade area and exist about 50 to 60 miles apart. In Appalachia the planners figured that a trade area of 200, 000 is required to provide a city of 25-50, 000 concentrated in one community with sufficient business activity in the radius of its trade area.

If we take the lower figure of 2500 as constituting the minimum size that can afford the types of services which people are increasingly demanding from both private and public producers, the outlook for most communities in this country is dim -- at least in terms of their traditional economic functions. There are more than 13, 000 incorporated units with less than this number of citizens (2500) across the nation. In Minnesota, ironically, state law now forbids the incorporation of a municipality of less than 500 people, a figure that is larger than the median-sized Minnesota municipality now in existence.

From my observation, few units of this size under existing arrangements can provide on a sophisticated level adequate police protection, adequate water or sewer facilities, or other public services increasingly demanded by the citizens. And indeed such small sized cities may not even be equipped to take advantage of federal programs designed to help them. Such small places seem to be characterized by underinvestment in private and public facilities. They also have excess ratios of the very young and the very old -- those age groups requiring, but perhaps not getting, the most attention from the public purse. Such communities are encountering difficult times in the face of declining farm population and increased mobility of those who remain, a mobility that is causing local residents to bypass their traditional village or hamlet for distant centers offering more variety and excitement. Even the little schools such hamlets used to maintain and which gave a hold on the loyalty of

---

[6]John Brewster, "What Kind of Special and Economic Order Do We Want in the Plains?" U. S. Department of Agriculture (July, 1964).

[7]Modernizing Local Government (July, 1966).

parents, are being swallowed up by larger population centers through consolidation.

Many such communities are fighting hard to stay alive, to protect a way of life they love and perhaps one which, sociologically speaking, may deserve to be protected. For instance, most of the anti-school-consolidation fight has its genesis in these communities. The bulk of Minnesota's local industrial development corporations (i.e. corporation communities formed to attract industry) are in communities of under 2500.[8] Those apparently with the least chance of attracting industry are fighting hardest for it. Some of them may be successful in developing a rounded growth pattern; many will not.

Projecting Future Development

History has rendered harsh verdicts on the survival chances of small communities faced with changing technology or dried-up natural resources A study in Colorado showed that in the period 1858 to 1900, 270 mining towns were founded. By 1929 most had disappeared.[9] A similar study in Arkansas showed that since 1900, 80 municipalities and an estimated 700 rural communities have completely or almost entirely withered away. In Appalachia today we are trying to revive with a substantial national program the communities still clinging precariously to life at the price of low incomes, poor health standards, and educational and cultural deprivation.

Most students of the subject seem agreed that the future of mini-cities is less bright the smaller they become; and their future, with exceptions, lies in rather radical transformation of function. Probably massive infusion of public aid could prop up many of these communities. We have subsidized many activities over our history, and in one sense we are doing it now with functional grant-in-aid programs aimed particularly at the small communities. This is a sociological choice, not an economic one; and from that point of view it may be a good choice depending on the circumstances and on one's system of values.

But when one starts talking economies of scale for business, jobs, education, governmental services, and hospital care -- professionals

---

[8]Robert Voigt, Upper Midwest Research Council, in an address delivered at the state convention of the League of Municipalities (June 19, 1968).

[9]Muriel S. Welle, Stampede to Timberline (Chicago: Swallow 1949).

are pretty well agreed. They are not for small communities. One can argue, of course, that for the privilege of living in a small community he is willing to forego some things. But what is good enough for Mother and Dad may not be good enough for Junior as he enters the productive age and almost invariably seeks more excitement, better job options, and more amenities of living elsewhere. The very poor and the technologically displaced also drift to the large city where attitudes and policies have been adjusted to recognize their plight and make provision for it, whereas in smaller communities they may not have been so adjusted. As one Department of Commerce study concludes: It has been the push of the poor rural conditions rather than the pull of economic opportunities that brought people to the large cities.

We have already commented that a shift in production techniques is underway from those that could be established in multi-story buildings to those that require single-story production lines and extensive land sites. This means locating outside large cities and even outside suburbia where land may be intensively used and is therefore expensive. Yet these techniques require a private infrastructure of auxiliary services and complementary economic activities in order to effect economies of operation. Such a complex of auxiliary services is not present for most small communities even though it represents a necessary though not a sufficient condition for "take off." We have also said that traditional plant location criteria are becoming less important. Increasingly, location decisions are determined by the availability of urban amenities such as adequate water and sewer systems, good schools, vocational training centers, regional government offices, and other public institutions -- an infrastructure of public facilities, if you will. As incomes have risen in this country, people's consumption habits have more and more turned toward the types of goods produced by government such as better streets, parks, playgrounds, schools. In a period of full employment the availability of such facilities for prospective employees becomes very much of a concern to plant site research teams.

Such requirements assume a relatively sophisticated government with a full-time staff for planning and servicing these needs with skill and training in the bureaucracy. Part-time government in small communities may not be adequate to meet these needs; and its tax base is generally minimal. What is more, the impersonality and detachment that allows for hard decisions, like raising the mill rate, is particularly difficult for small city decision-makers whose customers and neighbors are adversely affected and who may not have the vision and foresight of the more sophisticated and full-time elected official in the larger city.

From my observation it becomes increasingly difficult to meet public

service needs as one descends below 10, 000 in population, or even below 20, 000, at least the type of public services that may be necessary for community take off. It is also possibly more difficult to put together a capable leadership team from the community as the size shrinks. Certainly small size reduces the statistical probability of finding such talent. This difficulty is aggravated in many cases by the absence of relatively large members of educators and other professional people which colleges and regional governmental institutions bring with them. One early student of community quality improvement has commented that the solution is simple: Get high quality people to settle in your community and the rest takes care of itself. Such people possibly can be identified and tapped more easily in the micro-city community than in either the metropolis where they may be lost in a sea of humanity, or in the mini-cities where their numbers are small. The few scattered studies we have on local leadership, however, suggest it is a necessary though not sufficient condition for community growth.

Does this mean that all smaller cities, mini-cities, will disappear? Probably not. Twenty years ago they might have. Today modern road systems put them closer timewise to major growth centers which can provide jobs. Functions of these smaller cities will be transformed, most likely into bedroom communities with small, convenient shopping facilities. Public services in some cases will be provided by larger governmental units -- possibly counties or groups of neighboring governments that may pool their resources to get better police and fire protection. If they do not possess economies of scale, perhaps regional cooperation will produce them. Zoning, building codes, and overall land-use planning may well be done by the county or even the state or by new regions within the state. Areawide functions will be encouraged by a carrot and stick approach. The tax structure will have to be radically revised, with the state collecting a substantially larger percentage than at present of state-local revenues. Formulas stressing need and local tax effort will distribute state collected taxes back to localities, taking into account the grave disparities between the tax base of primarily residential settlements and the better balanced tax bases of mother cities.

Workers will travel five to fifty miles across the countryside to the larger cities for work, entertainment, shopping but will return to the comparative peace and spaciousness of smaller cities and hamlets at night. Federal and state subsidies will provide the sanitation facilities needed for residential areas while large schools may be located in the country as parts of huge but decentralized school districts several times the size of most present districts. This will equalize both the costs of education and its quality across the state.

The health of the countryside will depend on the health of the outstate mother cities which will act increasingly as economic, cultural, shopping, medical, and governmental service centers. The trade area of these mother cities will tend to resemble the early Greek city states with a major city, a number of satellite communities and farm land as constituent elements of its hinterland.

Thus, a new pattern of living and working will arise together with a new interdependence of governmental units. Proper public policy can ease the pangs of the transition period and then support repopulation of the countryside in many areas now declining. How soon this will occur depends much on what we do to bring this mosaic about. It seems to me that we are rapidly nearing the point at which the plight of our major cities will force concrete decisions on how to effect this rebuilding of the countryside and the potential mother cities in it. A nation that could populate the West in fifty years and put a man on the moon in ten years should not regard as impossible the redevelopment of a countryside no longer populated by white men or hostile Indians. The place to start this process is in natural growth centers, and the spillover will begin to radiate outward. Much remains to be done to help these potential growth centers in more ways than the limits of this short paper allow us to consider. I for one believe that with intelligent foresight we can avoid much of the human misery that accompanies the decline of agricultural population. However, a policy of drift in Minnesota may give us our own version of abandoned mining towns or vanished Arkansas farm towns.

This prescription for revitalizing our countryside and coping with our population growth may involve some political liabilities. Machiavelli said it well: "There is nothing more difficult to carry out nor more dangerous to handle than to initiate a new order of things." But failure to act also carries penalties. Lord Bacon warns us: "He that will not apply new remedies must expect new evils, for time is the greatest innovation."

It is going to be a difficult job to revitalize the countryside perhaps. But I think there are some prospects that this can be done if state legislatures and the Federal Congress have the will to do and enough information on which to base proper public policy. And that is one of the end products hopefully that the Micro-City Project is striving to accomplish.

5. PROTESTANT AND ECUMENICAL RESPONSES TO THE CHURCH'S TOWN AND COUNTRY MISSION

George K. Tjaden

All of our society, from the remotest neighborhood to the metropolitan centers, is undergoing rapid change. Not only is change taking place in the totality of man's experience; it is happening at an ever increasing pace. Much of society, including the church, is breathless in its attempt to keep up with the changing scene. At the same time, in many areas of its structure society has not begun to grasp, in any measure, what is really happening, let alone how it ought to respond to situations. There is a saying that has found a new place in our day: "Nothing is so permanent as change." The church has no difficulty with permanence but has much trouble with change.

Within the church one encounters a wide variety of concepts and actions for facing its task -- concepts that have developed at the various stages of our social development. The church, although one, has had many divisions and separations; many times this internal problem has hindered the church in giving effective leadership in molding society. A great measure of the church's ineffectiveness in meeting the change thrust upon our present generation has its roots in our differences within the body -- denominational, ethnic, theological, etc. These barriers have prevented effective communication of and engagement in our one task. No sector of the church has felt these estrangements more than our rural areas where the problems are intensified.

Although there is much on today's town and country scene that is discouraging, there are also hopeful signs. There is, for instance, a rising spirit which is gradually being incarnated in an orderly plan and process that, if seriously utilized, may result in great strides within the church, making it an effective redeeming agent for social change.

At this point it might be beneficial to approach our topic from three angles. First, I would like to present a brief survey of the historical circumstances under which our Minnesota society emerged. We will consider some of the historical factors that have had and are still having

an effect upon our church and community. Second, we will listen to what a few church leaders are saying, their criticisms and their counsel. Finally, I want to share with you what is beginning to emerge as a hopeful possibility for the church in its search for a valid response to the crisis in town and country.

Historical Perspective

When our town and country areas were settled, we were in the horse and buggy era. Of necessity churches were established about eight miles apart or the distance people could travel in an hour or less. Our towns, schools, and social circles were also organized according to the same sort of travel limitations. Neighborhoods spanned only a few miles' radius; and relatives living fifteen to thirty miles apart were seen once or twice a year. The church was the community and the social center, and it kept variations in faith and practice isolated. Ethnic groups settled in pockets or small communities all over the state, each maintaining its own particular denominational preference as well as language. This practice spawned many more parishes than our present society needs, can afford, or considers good stewardship. Furthermore, the barriers that arose segmented the larger trade centers and governmental units and concentrated emphasis upon differences rather than similarities in community.

Today's community is really radically different, although many refuse to think of it in these terms. Instead of four to six miles per hour, we travel forty to sixty miles per hour; and we will soon be going much faster. When Minnesota was settled, a community barely stretched to the limit of a radius of one hour's travel. All needs, with rare exceptions, could be met within the one hour travel limit. Based on such criteria, our community today can easily have a variety of expanses. We can travel forty to sixty miles in either direction or circulate in a community of about a hundred miles in diameter. Practically speaking, this means that we will bypass a dozen towns that were once necessary for providing essential needs, but now do not offer the selection of goods and services desired. We can easily and safely bus children to school twenty miles away for an education that is superior to that of the one room school. Our social contacts, recreational facilities, medical services, and many more advantages are secured throughout the larger community. The church, however, has not made these adjustments.

As we have made significant changes in almost every area of our social experience, we have hesitated in the area of stewardship, of meeting the spiritual needs of people in the best way possible; and society will no longer be politely patient with the institution of the church.

It is not true to say that the church has made no adjustments in the past or that it is making no adjustments today. Practically every denomination for some years has had a department dealing with town and country The seminary from which I graduated, for example, was designated to specialize in training pastors for the nonmetropolitan ministry, and I graduated with a major in the field of town and country church life. Out on the parish level many changes have been made to provide a more adequate ministry to people. Larger parishes, yoked fields, shared ministries, shared facilities, cooperative parishes, mergers, federations withdrawal of denominations, closing of churches, and abandonment are some examples. But the sad fact about some of these changes is that action has been the result of economic pressure rather than a realization of the need for more effective ministry to people in their communities.

Although changes have been accomplished within the structure ministering to local communities, there has been little real effort by the church to be a significant part of the coordinating influence in the total process of community development. As late as 1966 there were 4, 637 congregations or parishes in Minnesota. Only 49 percent of our population is outside the seven county metropolitan area, but 3, 450 of our churches are out there. This means that the 1, 187 congregations in the seven county metropolitan area serve 51 percent of our population while 3, 450 congregations serve only 49 percent. At the same time 3, 059 of the 3, 450 congregations were in counties where thirty percent of the families had an income of less than $3000 per year; and 2, 300 congregations were in counties which lost population from 1950 to 1960.

Criticism and Counsel of Church Leaders

There is no better place to begin listening to what churchmen are saying than to repeat a quotation from Dr. J. Elmo Agrimson, President of the Western North Dakota District, American Lutheran Church, a passage that served as the keynote for this lecture series:

> It disturbs me that possibly our church has placed so much emphasis on the individual's commitment to his devotional life... that she has not fully equipped the saints to enter the arena of economics, politics, education, and community concern.... We have been so busy with the liturgy in the chancel of the church that we have not seen the great music and tremendous symphony potential in every group of people outside

> the walls of the building. After all, people don't live in the church building. They don't live at the university. They don't live in welfare offices. They live in a community with hopes and dreams.

On one occasion Shirley Greene pointed out[1] that it is an oversimplification to say that American culture has become an urban culture and that all the changes taking place in town and country are reducible to this. Dr. Greene feels that to attempt to impose an "urban fundamentalism" on areas in which there are not at present important distinctive cultural ingredients, would be to repeat the errors of the past by merely substituting urban fundamentalism for agrarian fundamentalism. Nevertheless, definite changes have radically affected the rural picture and brought the church to the present state of crisis. Among these changes, Dr. Greene lists the following: (1) decline of agriculture; (2) the end of isolation; (3) accelerated mobility; (4) disappearance of neighborhood; (5) increase of leisure time. These changes in turn have resulted in a threat to the traditional value systems: (1) the family farm; (2) hard manual labor, (3) individualism and self-reliance; and (4) the sense of community.

Colin W. Williams, speaking at the 1964 National Convocation on the Church in Town and Country said:

> The church has placed itself with man not at the point where he is learning to come to grips with the future, but where he is trying to give himself that nostalgic bridge which gives him roots of security in the past.... But let me speak frankly: The greater sinners here are not just suburban churches, but rural churches. The rural church itself is the plainest case of institutional disobedience in American life.[2]

We hear of change on every side; we witness it every day; we are in-

---

[1]Shirley E. Greene, "The Church Faces Its Own Crisis in Relation to Community and Culture," The Church and Culture in Crisis in Town and Country, (St. Louis: United Church Board for Homeland Ministries, 1963), pp. 54 ff.

[2]Colin W. Williams, "Dialogue on Issues and Trends," The Church Meeting Human Needs, ed. Henry A. McCanna (New York: National Council of Churches, 1964), p. 107.

volved in it constantly; and we are, in part, responsible for it. In the past we have enjoyed certain securities: We have had our ethnic and language barriers. We established and cherished our theological variations which have also become barriers. We made barriers of our parish borders and imaginary fellowship groups. We have further imposed our denominational barrier walls upon people and revelled in our man-made excuses for being different. Protestant denominations -- and I have a feeling that Roman Catholics would want their church included -- have not done a good job of helping people understand what the church is, what the mission is here in the society of men. There has been too much emphasis on our differences rather than on our oneness. Emotional attachments to the visible and physical things included in the whole of the church have impressed more than the fellowship of Christian believers. In order to maintain a relationship to our past, we have deified the buildings and the cemetery and have clung together in isolation in order to preserve the physical symbols of our devotion.

Response to Church Mission

Now the rising ecumenical spirit is thrusting itself upon us with obvious necessity. We are beginning reluctantly to admit that God has been right all along: That there is but one church of Jesus Christ, that it is man who is guilty of making it confusing and divisive. This ecumenical mood is making real progress. It is shaking the foundations of the whole church; and if sincere open searching continues, there will be a great healing of the church. But we may as well be reconciled to the fact right now that the church, as we have experienced it, will not be the same. As the ecumenical spirit has begun to exert pressures, those of us working from an interdenominational vantage point have seen an evident scrambling by denominations to shore up some of their most precious institutional possessions and to dig trenches on new areas of confrontation with other segments of the church. In other words, it may be that even yet we are really not completely honest nor do we quite trust one another.

Planning, as I want to speak of it now, is quite different from the sort of planning done in the past. Every denomination has done considerable planning and strategizing in efforts to be effective. The major emphasis, however, has been on behalf of developing a strong congregation and in winning converts to their particular "brand" of Christianity. The need to help develop quality life for a community usually got little or no consideration. This is planning in competition at the expense of other denominations and community welfare.

Groups of denominations gathered through ministerial associations and councils of churches on county, city, regional, state, and national

levels have done considerable cooperating and planning. This activity has been admirable in many instances, but frankly it often helped people to admire their problems rather than preparing them to graple with them. Let us take an example. For almost thirty years the Minnesota Council of Churches has had a program of ministry to migrants, and many migrants have been helped throughout those years. At the same time, the Council has done much prodding and pressuring to get state and federal social agencies alert to make life more bearable for the migrant and to force employers to be more fair. Nevertheless, although we have been at this task for all these years and although the Catholics have had a similar program, the migrant is still referred to as the forgotten American and is thought of as a second class citizen. Not a month goes by without my meeting someone who is surprised to learn that there are even migrants in Minnesota, this in spite of the fact that last year there were 12, 000 to 15, 000 migrants in the State. Within the last six months I was told that a denominational executive staff member in our State had said, "I thought the church had turned migrant ministry over to OEO." It is sometimes easy to do just enough planning to plan a problem out of our concern.

I do not want to belittle what is happening in migrant ministry because there are good things happening, and more are in sight. Because there has been horizontal dialogue among the Council of Churches, Roman Catholic, and two other Protestant migrant programs, agreement has been reached to combine our ministry to migrants except in the areas of worship and doctrinal teaching. This is an achievement that can be chalked up as a major step in real ecumenical response; it is the route we must take in more areas of church mission.

So far I have not referred much to efforts of denominations to alleviate the tragic overchurched situation all over town and country America. Denominations are successfully merging parishes into more effective units. In some cases they are grouping parishes into larger parish or cooperative parish units. Parishes have in some cases federated, agreeing to operate as one parish while retaining denominational relationships. There are many combinations being effectively used, but the problem is that this activity is not keeping pace with change. We will not be sufficiently effective until we initiate and follow through on a sound planning process.

Perhaps the most promising development on the ecumenical scene is the establishment of a Department of Planning and Mission in the structure of the Minnesota Council of Churches. This department is made up of representatives of the denominations with membership in the State Council plus non-member denominations wishing to participate. The

department has two staff persons and is divided into two divisions: the metropolitan area and the outstate area which is responsible for the other eighty counties in the state. Just recently the metropolitan division asked that a study be done on the entire seven-county area. This will be used as a base from which planning for mission can proceed, a tremendous assignment but an essential beginning. In outstate areas we have made a number of studies of specific areas such as in Redwood County where both Protestant and Catholic churches are participating in the study. Last winter we completed a study of West Duluth; now, after a request for a study of another segment of the city, the Outstate Division is considering whether the whole of the Duluth area might be included in the project. Eventually we hope to compile basic information on the entire State that will become a basis for intelligent ecumenical planning for the whole church as it seeks to fulfill its mission in Minnesota.

6. IS THE CHURCH ON THE OFFENSIVE?

E. W. Mueller

I am going to talk about a subject that to many is ordinary and commonplace. To others it may be as uninteresting as a piece of cold toast. Yet, it is a subject as basic as food to the well-being of rural and urban dwellers. I am going to talk about the land areas over which many citizens fly and view from 25, 000 feet in the sky. I am going to talk about that part of the nation which many large city planners refer to as open space. I am going to talk about the countryside, the nonmetropolitan counties, where about one-third of the nation's citizens live. I am going to discuss the countryside which has spawned many of the inner-city problems that plague the nation. A basic reason lies in the fact that property rights have been guarded more zealously than human rights, that material values have been given precedence over human values.

Aspects of the Rural Crisis

It is a crisis of contradiction. One can see this, for example, in such areas as farming, education and health. The United States is the best fed nation in the world because of the productivity of its farmers; yet 25 percent of the farm population earns less than $2500 a year. Farmers in the Midwest are now in the process of harvesting a bumper corn crop (1968). Agricultural economists tell us that on an average, well-managed farm it costs 87 cents to produce a bushel of corn. Presently 18 percent moisture corn is selling on the open market for around 90 cents a bushel. Farmers have demonstrated a great ability to manage crops, cattle, and machines in the interest of the consumer. Up to now they have not been able to manage themselves as an interest group in the interest of the producer.

Young people from our Christian homes entering the teaching profession do so often by way of the church colleges. Since these people are a quality product, the schools in rural areas cannot afford them either because of the rural economy, the school district structures, or the attitudes of school boards. As a result the percentage of rural teachers not properly certified is about twice as high as for urban teachers.

We tend to associate accidents and bodily injuries with crowded conditions. The injury rate from motor vehicles, however, is the highest

among rural nonfarm residents. Rural farm residents have the highest rate of injuries caused by work-related accidents. At the same time, they are in a much poorer position to cope with accidents and the consequences of accidents than their urban cousins. The rural areas, for example, have about one-third of the nation's population, but they have only 12 percent of our physicians, 18 percent of the nurses, and 14 percent of the pharmacists. There is also a similar shortage in health facilities.

It is a crisis of loss of identity. There was a time when the word "rural" was a meaningful term. It referred to a definite sector of our population with its own values and customs. It described a style of life. Due to modern methods of transportation and communication, the problems of isolation have been overcome and the difference between rural and urban people has all but disappeared. All citizens are feeling the effects of technological innovation and the need to face up to the interrelatedness of our society.

Many institutions which for years had a rural department have discontinued their special rural concern. This concern has now been incorporated into the work of the body politic. On the surface, because of the interrelatedness of our entire society, this seems like a move in the right direction. The action to phase out rural departments of study, however, is based on the assumption that people in the countryside are adequately represented on the various committees and in the smaller decision-making units of an institution. This action is further based on the assumption that people selected at random to represent rural areas have the insight and ability to articulate adequately the needs to the body politic so it can intelligently deal with the needs of rural areas. It is a well-known fact that in a democratic institution in which the demands on the institution far exceed its resources, the needs that are not adequately articulated will be overlooked.

The seventy million people who make up the nonmetropolitan population living in the open country, villages, or various types and sizes of incorporated places, including the center cities, are voiceless and lack identity and leadership. This sector of the nation's population is not in a position to articulate its needs, fears, and hopes. If farm organizations worked together and as a group and sought to articulate the needs of the people in the countryside, they would speak for only a small portion of the seventy million in the nonmetropolitan areas.

We are in need of a new model for the countryside community -- a model that is built on the interrelatedness created by our technological innovations; a model that will involve open country people, hamlets,

towns, and center cities; a model that will bring together enough resources to meet needs; a model that will provide a structure so people in a viable planning unit in the countryside can plan and act in concert.

Since society is still struggling to develop a valuable planning model, the action to drop descriptive terms that give visibility to the concerns of an institution for people in rural areas is premature and contributes to a loss of identity.

It is a crisis of migration. In the last 25 years we have had the greatest migration of all times. In this period 19 million people have left the farms. The poorest counties with a median family income of less than $2000 in 1959 lost more than 600, 000 people. This is a loss of one-fourth of their 1950 population. Counties classed as all rural (no towns of 2500) having the lowest incomes have lost over two million people. Those who left rural America are ill prepared for life in large cities.

On the other hand, this migration has left fourteen million poor people behind; four million of these poor people are on farms. While outmigration has relieved population pressure, many of the problems of the outmigration area have been aggravated by the outmigration. It has left old people and children behind. The people who are left behind are ill-prepared to adjust their social structures to new population density.

It is a crisis of obsolete social structures. The land settlement pattern of our nation was based on hand labor, horsedrawn farm equipment, and primitive travel. The availability of tractor power, electric power, and advanced forms of technology result in a substitution of capital for people in the production of food and fiber. This decrease in the number of people needed to feed the nation has social implications.

Improvements in transportation due to better roads and fast moving cars substituted the area-oriented community for the place-oriented community. As a result we have more school districts, congregations, towns and political units than rural people can effectively use.

Rural people have accepted change in the area of production of food and fiber. They have not made similar adjustments in their social structures. They are saddled with social structures designed for land settlement patterns that have long disappeared.

The quality of the church ministry is impaired by too many church units. In southern Illinois a study revealed that in a five-county area

there was a congregation for every 246 people. A state like South Dakota has too many schools to be able to provide quality education to all its children.

While schools and churches are moving to make necessary adjustments, citizens are doing very little to update their political structures. It is difficult to estimate the human and financial cost of obsolete social structures.

It is a crisis of irresponsible adult behavior. We can find many examples of this aspect of the rural dilemma. Recently I had the privilege of taking part in three interdenominational consultations on church in community life. An educator from the state university discussed in detail the public school situation of his state. One of the problems he documented was the failure on the part of citizens to pay their school taxes as prescribed by law.

We have had farm programs for many years. They are designed to decrease production. Farmers deliberately devise means of defeating the intent of these programs. I have often publicly said that farmers will not vote for a program they cannot beat.

We have examples of irresponsible behavior in the sabotaging of the common good. One farm group seeks to develop a new approach to the cost-price squeeze and another group makes a deliberate effort to defeat the attempt. Communities deny each other adequate health facilities because they cannot agree as to location. Efforts to bring industrial employment to rural areas is often defeated because local businesses fear it will increase the local pay scale.

It is a crisis aggravated by a lack of integrity. It is very difficult for the general public to be conversant with the actual situation in the rural areas. There are many voices but very little agreement. It is not so much that these voices tell a false story but rather they do not tell the whole story or point out the implications. You see this in the failure on the part of the press to present clearly the actual farm picture. Let one farmer appear in Washington driving a Cadillac, and indirectly the impression is conveyed that all farmers drive one. The urban press challenges the farmer to stand up for an individualistic approach but does not spell out the consequences of individual action.

Our land-grant universities point out the advantages to the consumer of efficiency of production but say little about the social cost of the adjustment that must follow. Land-grant universities must look at agriculture in the context of rural life and not just as a commercial enterprise.

Another five million people will be leaving agriculture in the next twelve years. What will be the social cost of this outmigration? Our 1, 500, 000 farmers that now produce seventy to eighty percent of our food and fiber may well drop to 500, 000. Will this result in an improvement in the quality of life?

Farm organizations do not tell the whole story. While their emphasis on marketing is a move in the right direction, they tend not to emphasize that success will involve some production controls and that gains will in fact be rather modest. Others continually repeat the myth that it is impossible for farmers to organize and influence the pricing structure.

Furthermore, the social problems in the rural areas are not so concentrated as in the city; they are much more hidden. Leading citizens in rural areas tend to claim that they have no poverty in their area. The poor in rural America are not organized so they cannot tell it the way it is.

It is a crisis of communication. Through leading newspapers, radio, and television, the rural citizen is immediately made aware of most problems in the world. Mass media is largely a one-way communication; there is no way for rural people to respond or tell their story.

There is no communication among segments that make up the larger rural community. Rural America is organized vertically: county -- state -- nation; local service chapter -- state organization -- national organization; congregation -- conference -- district -- church body. A Lutheran pastor tends to have more contact with a pastor of his own church body thirty-five miles away than with a Methodist pastor or Roman Catholic priest in his own town. The many organizations to which rural people belong tend to be walls that keep people apart in a viable planning unit. There is a lack of horizontal communication between towns, organizations, and social systems which make up an area-community.

It is a crisis of inadequate values. Historically, the nation's agricultural policy has been shaped by three basic creeds:

THE DEMOCRATIC CREED: No one is so wise that he has a right to tell me what to do.

THE PRIVATE ENTERPRISE CREED: No one shall interfere in my business, not my neighbor, my

farm organization, nor my government.

THE PROFICIENCY CREED: A farmer has status among his peers if he can set production records.

These creeds have placed the farmer in a bind. He is caught up in his own value system that hinders him from a commitment to any organization when it conflicts with short-term self-interest. This situation accounts for his overproduction even when he knows that price times volume in an excessive surplus situation has never meant more income from a given crop.

The churches have supported these values. This in itself is not wrong; the error, however, is that they did not emphasize that something is missing, namely, the value that the strong must help the weak. This value I choose to call the creed of fulfillment.

All men indeed have equal worth since their worth is determined by their creation and not by their intellectual or managerial capacity. All men do not have the equal capability. The greater a person's capacity, the greater his responsibility to help people of lesser capability to find fulfillment. The Christian value system guards the weak from being exploited by the strong. The Reformers emphasized the importance of the individual, but they also had much to say about the individual's responsibility to the brotherhood. The individual's responsibility to his group and the group's concern for the well-being of the community and the nation have not received adequate attention.

A spirit of neighborliness built the American countryside in the early days of our nation. It was a neighborliness where farmer helped farmer in the barn-raising bee or the threshing ring. This same quality is needed among towns and center cities to build the area-community. The rural crisis that faces the nation is not due to a lack of food and fiber but to a breakdown of meaningful relations between people. It basically is a problem of human relations.

A Basic Assumption

My basic assumption is that the church is seeking to change its posture from the defensive to the offensive. Many churches began as immigrant churches; they followed their people. They moved from the position of a guardian role to that of extending the church to the unchurched of our land. Today the church goes beyond, extending itself into the world.

I am assuming that the church:

...Is concerned about the unmet needs of men and with the well-being of all of life.

...Will not tolerate the misuse of God's earth or the exploitation of people.

...Knows that all men and all institutions live and function under the judgment of God, whether society knows it or not.

...Sees its responsibility is greater than adjusting to every social and economic trend.

...Possesses spiritual resources and objective truths and when rightly used can shape the style of life.

...Is unwilling to sit idly by and let uncontrolled forces turn vast land areas into a mere efficient food and fiber production machine.

...Is ready to contend that quality life is compatible with efficiency of production if the selfishness of men is held in check.

Against this background I ask the overarching question, Do we have the conceptual tools to move from a defensive to an offensive posture? When we change from a defensive to an offensive war, we need different tactics. This leads me to four subquestions.

1. Do we have the conceptual tools to deal with the changes which bring about decline?

Change takes place in a democratic society when people are given the opportunity to do certain things in more than one way. When the farmer plowed his fields with horses not many changes took place. When he was given the chance to use a tractor and he chose the tractor, he initiated a host of other changes. Changes are the result of the choices people have made. Thus as we said earlier, when farmers choose to invest in farm equipment, -- to substitute capital for people -- we find that we need fewer churches and fewer schools. A sensible adjustment calls for closing a congregation. Do we have the conceptual tools to help people see that closing a church which is no longer needed is a mission accomplished and not a failure?

2. Do we have the conceptual tools to deal with the realities of our highly organized and mechanized society?

The pastor tends to have his finest hour at the death bed and at the open grave, for he has spiritual resources to confront the realities of death. On the other hand, he finds real difficulty in dealing with other realities of life -- the economic and social facts of his community, such as the cost-price squeeze and the waning economy of the small town. Pastors and laymen need a Christian world view that sees all of life functioning under the judgment of God.

We are rightly impressed by the creativity of man. But do we always realize that behind creativity stands the very creativity of God? I grew up on an Iowa farm and can remember the violent thunder storms, accompanied with wind and sometimes hail. When danger of destruction by wind, lightning, and hail hung ominously over our home, a devout mother gathered her five children around her and prayed for divine protection against the elements. In the course of human events, man discovered that hail insurance was more effective. We must now move from a prayer for protection to a prayer of gratitude. The check from the hail insurance company is as much a gift of God as the check from the grain elevator. The hail insurance company is as much a creation of God as the corn or the wheat plant.

3. Do we have the conceptual tools needed so that congregations will function as a parish?

Our concept of a parish seems to include only a concern for our constituency. It seems not to include the common mission that we have with other Christian denominations and other nonchurch institutions which have a genuine concern for the well-being of people.

Churches need an adequate concept of parish. The tendency has been for a pastor to consider the people who belong to his congregation as his parish. A parish is a unit, an area, with definite boundaries. All the people living within the boundaries of a parish are a part of a pastor's parish -- members of other congregations, unchurched people, his own members. The type of relationship he maintains with these different groups, however, will vary. He will have a professional relationship with his own members; with others, a citizen relationship. The important thing is that he have a concern for the well-being of all people in his parish.

There is a place for the denomination that represents a distinctive conviction and is meeting a currently existing need. The approach used in meeting the need must be in keeping with good stewardship. We cannot channel the Holy Spirit into man-made structures, nor can we organize the activity of the Holy Spirit. We must provide various types of

structures and organizations which the Holy Spirit can use to accomplish his work among men. We must move in the direction of wholeness without loss of basic convictions and diversity.

4. Do we have the conceptual tools to move aggressively and intelligently into a pluralistic society and become actively involved in community development?

If community development is to move us in the direction of excellence in living with concern for the spiritual well-being of people, then people must give attention to understanding the role of the church in a pluralistic society that has a multiplicity of community organizations and agencies. The church's role as an institution is not to be the creator nor the developer of the citizen community. This is the role of individuals and of the community's social agencies. The church's role is to bear witness before individuals and organizations to the basic truth that all phases of the citizen community are under the judgment of God.

The church's goal is to develop citizens with definite convictions -- citizens who have the desire, courage, knowledge, and capability to articulate basic concepts and values in community discussions and decision-making groups. Better stated, the goal is the development of church members who in their own way have the capacity to be the church in the concrete situations of their own citizen communities.

There are four basic steps in community development. The first is that of IDENTIFYING NEEDS OR PROBLEMS. This involves gathering facts, doing research, and organizing study programs. Church bodies can accomplish this together and in cooperation with educational institutions and research agencies. The socio-economic facts are the same for all church groups.

We then move to the second step which is that of DISCOVERING ALTERNATE COURSES OF ACTION TO MEET NEEDS; this, too, churches can do together.

MOTIVATING INDIVIDUALS TO ACTION is the third step in our process. Church groups best accomplish this by themselves through their worship services. The Christ-exalting congregation or the Christ-exalting church group will motivate its members on the basis of what lies behind them, rather than on the basis of what lies before them. It is the love for the world that God demonstrated on the Cross that motivates Christians to action. The driving zeal in St. Paul's life was not the unchurched people in Asia Minor but his personal encounter with Christ on the way to Damascus. The people in need are our opportunity to respond

to divine confrontation. Their need is not the power that motivates the Christian to action. The love of Christ motivates him; this sets him apart from the humanist.

Finally, step four can be described simply as ACTION. Needless to say, motivation needs to be followed by action. More and more Christians will need to find ways of acting together and with people who are not of the Christian tradition. In this sense we need to learn to minister with the world without giving up the task of witnessing to the world. The basic crisis we face in our countryside parishes is that we are in a period of history which demands that our laymen go on the offensive against the forces of evil. Yet, many parishes are still preparing laymen for a defensive assignment.

Six Guidelines

1. KNOWLEDGE MUST WORK FOR US. The story is told of a Korean tomato farmer who took good care of his soil and his plants. When the tomatoes were ripe, he sold the well-formed tomatoes because they brought the best price. He took his seed for the next year's crop from the misformed fruit. For him knowledge was not working; he had not learned the principle of seed selection. While knowledge has worked for us in the area of technological innovation, we have not as effectively used available knowledge in the area of social innovations.

2. THE CHURCH MUST DO LESS. But the church must do more adequately its precise task of witnessing, teaching, and providing Christian nuture. At the same time, the congregation must broaden its concern for people so that it may be as inclusive and as intensive as God's concern for his people. Such dedication to the needs of man is not restricted to church structures, for there are situations when basic concerns can be expressed more adequately through a community structure. We have examples of this in the soil and water conservation districts and in community hospitals. The church has a real concern for soil and water conservation and for health, but it uses as the structures for expressing its concern the established agencies servicing these needs.

3. A MEANINGFUL WORSHIP SERVICE IS OUR MAIN RESOURCE. What makes a worship service meaningful is not its form but the aspects of divine confrontation and human response. Man as a creature is confronted by the God of Scripture: Who he is, what he has done and does, and what he expects of man. Man's response to this confrontation is three dimensional: a closer relationship with God because of his assurance of the forgiveness of sin; a more meaningful relationship to his fellowman because his only way to show his love of God is by his com-

passion and concern for his fellowman; and an orderly and productive relationship with his environment for man has been given the task of caring for the earth.

4. WE NEED TO MINISTER WITH THE WORLD RATHER THAN TO THE WORLD. As we minister with the world (e.g. Christians in the Peace Corps), we bear witness to our motivation. While it may be different from that of others who work with us, it is not an occasion to sit in judgment of someone else's motivation but an occasion to share the source of our motivation.

5. WE RECEIVE FROM THE GOSPEL THE POWER TO ACT BUT NOT THE PATTERN FOR ACTION.

6. WE MUST NOT MAKE THE TASK MORE DIFFICULT THAN IT IS. Jesus said, "You shall be my witnesses." He did not say, "You shall be my lawyers." The role of the witness in the courtroom is different from that of a lawyer. The role of the witness is not to win the case; this is the responsibility of the lawyer or the Holy Spirit. The witness has the responsibility to bear testimony. Our difficulties multiply when we seek to be witness, lawyer and judge.

A Word of Hope

The countryside will not develop to its full potential until the vast nonmetropolitan areas are divided into viable planning areas. This is being done in some states and leaders should be aware of it, exploring the feasibility of using the planning areas as the basis of developing the countryside. This, of course, will mean that neighborhoods and small cities will need to see themselves as being a part of one area complex and that they must work together in the interest of developing the area.

Today town and country society is no longer a land area made up of independent family farm units, isolated villages, and towns that each has its own separate social institutions. Today it is one web of human activity, tied together into an area complex. An area complex includes many different types of socio-economic units -- villages, towns, and small cities -- each of which has its schools, churches, and community services. A viable planning unit, which is discovered not created, brings together enough resources that all the needs of the people can be met with quality programs.

The significance of a functional economic area becomes apparent if we see it as a large city of more than 100,000 in population, spread over an extensive land area. A functional economic area supplies all the

services that a large city provides. The different functional areas in a given state have many similarities such as total population, economic resources, college graduates, labor commuting patterns, and available services. Given all these similarities it seems at least plausible that programs which are within the capacity of one area will also be available within the capacity of other areas. Therefore, the economic functional area can serve as a basic planning unit in parish development and in church studies and planning.

Our church colleges are beginning to think in terms of providing a special service to this type of area-community. The services they will be providing would include facilitating the development of the area-community, encouraging area planning, and providing an informal education program to area leaders. If these multicounty planning units become a model for countryside planning, they will help solve rural problems and urban problems. This will also make it necessary for Christian people to coordinate their efforts so that the different programs in which they are involved and the different organizations to which they belong complement each other whenever possible. Then there is hope that we can achieve the desired goals of strong congregations with adequate facilities and a better use of church resources.

7. TACTICS FOR THE CHURCH ON THE OFFENSIVE

Arleon Kelley

The story is told of a three hundred pound woman who had fallen on the sidewalk. A crowd soon gathered around her. Everybody knew what the problem was, but nobody knew how to get hold of it. The church, both in the city and in the non-metropolitan areas, has become increasingly aware of its problems in recent years; but we have not yet found a consistently workable way to get hold of these problems and to move forward towards a solution of them. This article does not contain any panaceas for solving the dilemmas of either the city or the countryside. Our experiences for the past ten years in dealing with the issues involved, however, have provided us with ideas, trends, and insights which I would like to share with you.

As Dr. E. W. Mueller has so ably pointed out, the church has been on the defensive. It has made the past more sacred than the present and has been so enamoured with the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob -- in the image of the little country church that great-grandfather, grandfather, and Uncle Henry built -- that it has not effectively related its faith to the twentieth century. We are still trying to go to church by horse and buggy in an era of rockets! What we have done is to deify the way grandfather did things in the church and call that our faith. We do no honor to grandfather by resisting change in his name, for grandfather was a creative old man. But creativity does not just happen. Creativity is the project of rational minds interacting in the exploration of all the variables which comprise a problem situation until workable means are devised to solve the problem. What, then, are the variables?

A Look at Inherent Variables

Perhaps the first variable we must consider in the effective ministry of the church is the faith itself. The unique contribution of Christianity lies partly in its proclamation that man's redemption frees him for participation in the ongoing processes of creation. God is the author of change because he is the Creator, and creation is a process not yet fulfilled. Redemption means that the creature, man, has submitted his will to the will of the Creator. The security of the church, therefore, is not in changelessness but in the author of change, God We are called in our

redemption to be participants in the fulfillment of creation through meaningful work or vocation and toward justice in society at all levels so that all creation might be reconciled to the Creator.

Correlated to this theological task is the necessity of sharpening our instruments of ministry, our institutions both sacred and secular. Our institutions are the vehicles which make it possible for us to focus our most creative thoughts for maximal effect in our society. They are designed to fulfill human needs, but these needs are being manifested in new ways. Fundamentally, the church is an institution designed to help man fulfill his deepest yearnings and to be the initiator of that which gives meaning to life throughout society. The family is a fundamental institution to procreate children, to experience love, to share a set of values, and ultimately to provide whole individuals for effective involvement in society. The governmental structures are fundamental vehicles to maintain just relationships among people, among economic and social systems of our society, and among nations. The economic institutions are necessary to provide equitable means of production, distribution, and consumption of food, fiber, minerals, and services. These several examples point to the fact, then, that every fundamental institution is necessary for the fulfillment of man's basic needs. But no particular form of institution is ordained by God. If they become self-serving, they are self-defeating. They must evolve if they are to serve in the dynamic dimensions of creation.

But we are facing crisis. These institutions not only serve us, but their very presence instructs the next generation. The media, however, is the message; and as Marshall McLuhan has noted in his recent book War and Peace in the Global Village, history is catching up with us.

In the past changes have been the consequence of new inventions. They came so slowly that society had a chance to adjust before being overwhelmed. Now, however, the rate of change has become much more rapid producing a situation in which there is no time lag between the introduction of a new technology and its full impact. Man can no longer count on the study of history to provide him with clues on how to protect himself from his own stupidity. No longer can he drive with one eye on the road ahead, and one on the rearview mirror to see what happened. What happened is what is happening! Television has made the whole world a village; the computer has extended the human nervous system to the limits of space.

Needs are being modified so fast through the technological explosion that our institutions are not evolving fast enough to meet these needs.

Religion is not providing the new values necessary for a worldwide, leisure-oriented, urbanized culture. We are still saying that the highest good is meaningful work, inferring that leisure is not meaningful. Government has tried to do its work through bureaucracy, but in a mass culture it is too slow and overlapping to meet human needs effectively. Economic institutions are ineffective in adequately spreading the wealth to all as they are intended to do. When institutions become dysfunctional to human needs and fail to respond creatively, they are either bypassed or destroyed. Revolution is a sometimes result. Certainly there are signs of revolution in our society today. Revolution, however, is not an alternative becuase it severs us from all the resources of the past. The only viable alternative is rapid evolution of our institutions in order that they might serve their purposes in the society of men.

But how do we do this? How do we propose to interact these variables of meaningful individual security (theology) and meaningful institutions to provide a responsive and just society for all? Do we do it by defensively protecting the past? The answer to this question must be a resounding NO! We must do it by taking the initiative in providing meaningful change. We must, as responsible Christians, take the offensive. This challenge raises a multitude of questions: How do we do it? Where must it be done? Who must be involved? Specifically, how does each person at nis point of service in Christ's church engage himself, along with others similarly concerned in the creative mission and ministry?

A Model for the Church on the Offensive

Most football fans know that their team cannot win the game by playing the whole game protecting their own goal posts. Defense is necessary for the weak, but the offensive is the privilege of the strong. The church enjoys great strength; its resources in America are third only to government, business and industry. But it is a sleeping giant, defending the past rather than aggressively getting involved in calling the plays for creativity and justice in our society. The giant is weak because of fragmentation and suffers with a general weakness resulting from inactivity and with a low morale which in turn is related to self-fulfilling prophecy. The sociological theory that says we cause that to happen which we expect will happen. (Thus, if we expect nothing, that is what we get). So very simply we are confronted with the question of how to nudge the giant into creative wakefulness? How can our team get the ball and run with it?

I agree with Dr. Mueller in theory that the churches should be the conviction units and that they should free their people from church

activities so that they may function creatively as Christians in their communities. But, as Dr. Mueller would doubtlessly agree, there is a lot of work to be done between here and there. In other words, functionally speaking, how does the church get from its high-powered institution building programs -- so prevalent in most denominations in the 1950's and 1960's and so absorbing of human and financial resources -- to a position of deploying its human and financial resources as a servant of the community? And secondly, where are the worthy places to deploy these resources?

These two questions imply that to get from where we are to Dr. Mueller's conviction, discussion, consensus, and action units, there are really two functional tasks involved. The internal task involves change in the church as an institution so that the resources it possesses not be absorbed within. Ecumenical Designs said, "Protestantism absorbs into its structure so great a proportion of its available resources that it has little appreciable impact upon society. It must be shorn of every possible structure and streamlined for dialogue with an ministry in the world."[1] Secular society requires this new kind of efficiency from the church. It can no longer expect, in a secular society, to find its excesses supported by the secular Christian.

There is a second, external task of the church. Historically pietistic Protestantism has assumed that the church was to build the moral character of the individual; and then the individual of moral conviction was to be diffused through society to represent that moral and ethical stance. From a certain standpoint that is all right; but in a secularized, urbanized society it is naive to assume that society is only the sum total of the individuals who comprise it. On the contrary, it is made up of traditions, interest groups, organizations, institutions, and systems of self-interest. The individual is important, but the fact remains that he does not have much "clout" in the complexities of even a rural pluralistic society. The media is the message! And the church is going to have to use its institutional base as an influential source of action for justice and creativity among the other self-serving pressure groups of our society. At the same time, the church must be free to join forces with those pressure groups that are functioning toward goals which are similar to the concerns of the church.

---

[1]Published Report, Ecumenical Designs (New York: The National Consultation on The Church in Community Life), 1967, p. 5.

How do we as the church know with whom we should join our resources? I suggest that we have a criterion; but it is not simply that of "the church must be where the action is." The criterion comes from the very heart of Christianity's self understanding: The doctrine of the Trinity, I propose, is the basis of evaluation. It is a doctrine representing a profound understanding of the diversity in unity and wholeness. The doctrine, as we understand it, is not prescribed in the Scriptures but rather developed in the early fourth century when Christianity became an accepted religion in the diverse Roman Empire. It emerged as a doctrine because of such questions as, "How do we as Christians know who our allies are in this type of pluralistic empire? Whom can we trust? Who is worthy of our support, meager as it may be?

In response to these questions, the Ecumenical Council of Nicea in 325 A. D., which enunciated the doctrine of the Trinity, said that: (1) Wherever the work of creativity is going on in the empire -- a task which is the function of the Father -- there must the church also involve itself; (2) wherever there are forces at work which are producing reconciliation in society and wholeness in persons -- the work of the Son -- there must the church be involved; and (3) wherever there are forces at work which are producing vital community -- the work of the Holy Spirit -- there too the church must lend its support. This was the way Christianity defined the different parts of its single task when it was an officially tolerated minority religion in a diverse, pluralistic culture. I submit that this is precisely where we find ourselves today: a tolerated religion in a diverse, pluralistic society. I further suggest that the formula of the Trinity is a valid formula to guide our missionary task today. [2]

Application through Involvement

But how do we accomplish this? How do we engage in renewal of the church so that it is free to be involved in its missionary task in its community? Renewal and community involvement cannot be externally imposed; they must arise from within. Furthermore, these tasks of the church cannot come unilaterally. I therefore propose that the "handle" we need to get a hold of our problem lies in three levels of involvement:

THE LOCAL CHURCH. The task here for the church is one of soul searching as to its role and function. It goes without saying that we Protestants have been too proliferated. In the past it was a necessity

[2]These ideas in part are dependent on a lecture given by Dr. Max Stackhouse, Professor at Andover-Newton Theological Seminary.

for principally two reasons. First, many of our churches historically were founded for ethnic reasons. They bridged the gap between the security provided by the culture of the fatherland and the unknown qualities of the frontier culture. Secondly, because of the slowness of travel the proliferation of local churches was a practical need. These two historical preconditions, however, are no longer realities. Third and fourth generation Americans, regardless of ethnic backgrounds, have more in common to join them than they have to separate them. The automobile has made transportation and distance less of a problem. Our congregations can best serve, then, by joining hands with other congregations so that the institutional resources are adequate. This will come about, however, only through joint discussion both within denominations and across denominational lines.

THE LOCAL NEIGHBORHOOD. With the advent of automobiles, what were once communities are now only neighborhoods. The churches, if no one else is doing it, must initiate neighborhood dialogue and discussion. Our democracy is dependent upon local responsibility, but we have tended to "pass the buck" to bureaucratic structure and then wonder why things do not work out the way we wanted. A voice must be developed within the community itself. In the absence of other social leadership, the churches have the responsibility to begin the discussion which leads to realistic confrontation with the issues. If some other agency is doing this, it is essential that the church dramatize its support by delegating or commissioning some of its membership to represent the church in the dialogue. From this process of local thinking, task groups to initiate action can and must emerge.

THE NEW COMMUNITY. This level of involvement can be described as the functional area and is comprised probably of a population of 25, 000 or more serving in an area approximately sixty miles in diameter. The judicatories of the church -- districts, associations, presbyteries -- must begin to take a holistic view of issues, to be supportive of the local endeavor where it is creative, redemptive, and building a sense of community; but they must also be prophetic and innovative in those social systems and neighborhoods where inactivity abounds. This too requires sustained conversation among the denominations and between the denominations and the secular world. We must plan together; if we plan separately, the United Methodists, for example, will invariably counteract the United Church's or the Lutherans' best laid strategy for mission. We need a process by which the church can confront change in integrity; external administrative decisions in the church only result in hostility and alienation.

The dialogue action process is just that -- a process. It is described in many places but specifically in Planning for Action.[3] There is, however, one particular aspect of this process that I would like to emphasize. We tend to be rather pessimistic about accomplishing anything through discussion. There seem to be two principle reasons for this. First, the discussion process must be continually moving forward. In any discussion new ideas are a threat to many; and subconsciously such people will turn the conversation back to more familiar ground as a defense. This in turn results in monotonous rehashing and inactivity which causes the creative gradually to drift away. Secondly, many groups are not dramatic enough. I had a professor who always said that we must continually dramatize our objectives. This means doing some things which will evoke discussion, catch the imagination, and force calculated action and reaction. You can move only as people become involved; and involvement is a value, whether negative or positive, because ultimately everyone's ideas are modified in the process. I would suggest that this can be done through model building.

Model building is dreaming, dreaming about what might be. It forces one to take the present and future identifiable variables in the community's life and build some goals based on these variables and the aspirations for the community. It is a process which helps a person to move outside himself and his immediate predicaments. We spoke above of the sociological principle known as the "self-fulfilling prophecy" which essentially means that man tends to cause to happen that which he thinks is going to happen. A model, then, is a new dream of what he thinks is to come about.

Implementation of the Model

In closing, let me illustrate what model building resulted in achieving, in one Indiana FEA (Functional Economic Area). Forty persons spent a year together in study and discussion about the role, function, and shape of the church in that area. Eventually they listed a series of variables which they felt must be included in a model of ministry and service:

- urbanization trends that viewed the urban center and the rural hinterlands as a complementary unit

- growing secularization resulting in a reduced institutional

---

[3]Planning for Action: Aids For Leaders In Church Planning, ed. Arleon Kelley, a publication of the National Consultation on the Church in Community Life (New York, 1968).

base of the church that made integrity and efficiency essential

- pragmatic ecumenicity -- People go to the church that fulfills their needs regardless of denominational background. (The study group recognized, however, that denominations are the base and source of present operation.)

- increased specialization vocationally and throughout society which means that the professional clergy will also have to have a specialty

- the increasing influence of the mass media

- the necessity of linking discussion and action

- the necessity of communication from the neighborhood up and the region down

- the functional interrelationship of all aspects of the community, rural and urban

- the necessity of reinterpreting the values of an agrarian culture to make life meaningful in the emerging urbanized culture

- the necessity of the church to deploy rather than to absorb resources

With this background, the group was able to construct an integrated model which in fact will modify every decision made at all levels of the church and its involvement in the community. Although the model will never be fully implemented as dreamed, it will move the church and the churches in creative directions and relationships. More importantly, it will become a cohesive force.

In conclusion, God is calling us to join him in creativity. In creativity comes security because we become participants with him in fulfilling the perfection for which creation yearns. Our response, then, will be crucial: creativity or the status quo, God or chaos.

8. PLANNING FOR TOMORROW: COOPERATION FOR HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Osgood T. Magnuson

Man is living in one of the most exciting periods in history, a time that in spite of troubled forebodings is filled with promise. It is the promise of a richer, fuller life with the opportunities for bringing its potential to fruition as masters of technology and with multiple relationships among persons and institutions. Man is confronted with new concepts in leisure. A decreasing need for physical labor for human survival frees him to appreciate, understand, and develop the increasingly complex systems of individual and institutional interdependence. Indeed, he faces an exciting, enriching life filled with challenges and satisfactions.

Broadening Horizons

This preamble suggests the vital need for emphasis on planning for tomorrow which in fact means cooperation for human development. This planning and cooperation cannot be limited to individuals but must be equally shared by the institutions of our society. Certainly such a listing will include the churches, educational institutions, public agencies, cultural entities, communications enterprises, industry, agriculture, and government. This cooperative effort involves in a deeper way basic values and attitudes, theological positions, educational philosophies, practical politics, and the hard task of goal identification. If man, for example, chooses to follow a consumption-oriented pattern of living rather than one oriented to production, the leisure industries will need to adjust and expand rapidly. An immediate question that arises, however, concerns the response of the rest of society. How, for instance, will it sense the difficulties this change in living patterns can raise for the disadvantaged? Or are they perhaps better equipped to change except for the money factor?

As one pursues this joyous daydreaming -- which is yet not unrealistic in attainment -- how do we plan and cooperate to achieve this kind of fulfillment for man? One might speculate that educational institutions will teach the year around, four days a week, and adopt educational concepts that enable acceptance of new values and attitudes. Industry will produce what is necessary, with leisure enterprises rising to the challenge of man's new way of life. Agriculture will produce food and fiber

even more efficiently which means pain for some; and the mass media will provide world-wide instantaneous communication. The most difficult area, however, might well be in the theological community. Can we, after our history of Judeo-Christian tradition, our Western world work ethic, develop a concept of leisure that frees man from guilt for a life intended to be a celebration of God's blessings? As I view life today, this becomes an area of major concern. The material development will continue, but will man be free to "celebrate" the joys of life or must he be under guilt, emotional stress, mental instability, and threat of punishment resulting from a cultural mentality that views leisure as "wasted time," as only a respite from production?

Of equal concern is the kind of community in which we wish to live. Will it be a community that struggles painfully to retain what was or will it plan and cooperate enthusiastically for what can be? At this stage we must begin to examine what planning for tomorrow entails. The churches, schools, agencies, and government must dialogue together toward goal-setting for community development, realizing that understanding and interdependence are complementary realities of common, creative action. Departments of theology in tax-supported universities, for example, would enhance the possibilities of more adequate understanding among the disciplines, equipping professionals to appreciate theological postures, and perhaps increasing the impact of theology on the decision-making and goal-setting among individuals in society. By the same measure, theology would also become better acquainted with the aspirations and goals of the other disciplines.

Although community development is usually viewed as economic improvement with the achievement of more of the amenities of life, there are those who view it as an educational process. In other words, these people see the process of what happens to people as equivalent to traditional interpretations; Rural Areas Development (R. A. D.) was heavily weighted to this process attitude. As concerned individuals who wish to enhance the broad spectrum of meaning in human existence, we need to recognize the significance of the "process" in community development. At the same time, while our "town-and-country" communities offer us a good opportunity for putting into concrete action the insights gained from this methodology, it is necessary for us to expand our concept of community itself.

In 1915 researchers in Iowa tried to find the criteria for defining community and finally ended up with two. The first was the distance a person could travel in one hour's time; the second was the behavior pattern of people in the community, not a qualitative analysis of behavior, good or bad, but the way people did things, where they went to do them, and so

on. In 1965 the study was repeated and the same two criteria were discovered. The significant difference was that in 1915 there were ten communities in a county, and in 1965 there were ten counties in a community. One can see why there are deeper kinds of concern when we think of our community, that it is no longer just the municipality where we get our mail but a much larger complex of interrelated units. It is interesting to note that in the Iowa study the researchers found that people traveled the greatest distance -- 33 miles -- to buy women's ready-to-wear clothes and the shortest distance -- three miles -- to go to church Perhaps this helps illustrate some of the underlying attitudes that confront those concerned with the development of town and country America.

Basic Concerns

Our planning and cooperation for human and community development needs to include a number of concerns. First, if we are going to achieve our goals, we need to have an awareness of the community. This is not a general, abstract understanding but one that is particular and concrete. As people begin to plan for their community, they have to take a look at a number of different factors. They must, for instance, look at the churches, the schools, the economic resources, the availability of capital to be advanced. They have to understand governmental structures and agencies. They need to examine the adequacy of the curriculum in the schools; and they need to have an awareness of the society beyond the immediate community. A friend of mine who spoke at our town and country institutes last year talked of equipping today's youth for tomorrow's world. He said that young people are going to live in a more pluralistic society, in a world that is much more crowded where greater interdependence will be required.

A second concern is the need for exploration. We have to explore the full spectrum of needs found in a community as well as the sensitivities of its people, their hopes for and fears of the future.

Finally, in the planning process, consideration must be given to the aspects of initiative and action. If the church as an institution wants to bring about change in the community, it has to begin to act. By this I do not mean unilaterally or by decree, but rather by getting involved with people, offering to meet with them to find out what is going on, and perhaps providing some kinds of leadership. These are serious tasks for any institution concerned with change and development in a community. People must be encouraged and aided in discussing the issues, needs, resources, and the realities of achievement in order to develop a strategy and an approach to problems that will gain some kind of consensus. People have to understand, to listen, to learn, to ask questions. These

are essential parts of the social action process. We have to be able to arrive at some level of consensus with other people as to what we are going to do.

Fruits of Community

Furthermore, there are things that a community ought to provide its people. It ought to provide security so that they feel safe and wanted; it ought to provide opportunity for expression and achievement in relationship. It ought to be in a position to equip its youth for the world in which they are going to live and to equip its adults to understand that world and the young people who are going to live there. I think a community has to provide opportunities for each individual to have some degree of success and achievement. If it does not, then people will go where they can attain these things. Finally, in the matter of cooperation, I think we need to recognize that each institution and each group of individuals in the community has to be willing to understand the other's program and the other's goals in life. This is as necessary for the church as for any other group.

The Road Ahead

Dr. Mueller says that one of the real challenges to the town and country community is to be a significant and responsible minority; I think this is a task for all of us. The process of planning and cooperation for human development is an endless one, one fraught with frustration and enhanced by achievement. It is significantly successful as men are free to celebrate the full life. For you and me, this is an exciting adventure, destined to satisfy but never to be fully achieved. We have to work together institutionally and individually, assuming that basically we are working to improve the lot of all mankind. We have to decide whether that lot is going to be improved by holding on to what was or by planning, in excitement, for what can be.

Other CARA Town and Country Publications